THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. 14 JULY, 1939 NO. 3

CONTENTS

		PAGE
The Reflective Element in Falstaff	*Samuel A. Small*	131
Shakspere in 1596	*A. L. Everett*	144
A Biography of Autolycus	*Christine White*	158
Shylock and Portia	*John E. Hannigan*	169
The Literary Origins of Robert Greene	*Thomas H. McNeal*	176
Shakspere and the Doctrine of Cosmic Identities	*Don Cameron Allen*	182
Editorial Note	*S. A. Tannenbaum*	190
Communication		191

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

THE REFLECTIVE ELEMENT IN FALSTAFF

By SAMUEL A. SMALL

(*Concluded*)

Except for a charming wit, Falstaff has no kindly qualities to cover over a distinct moral laxity. He is cowardly and selfish. In spite of these mean traits, he is not callous and hard, except at times. He is fretful and touchy. He is made so by the infirmity of his body and by his advanced age. All his gay spirits, therefore, are weighed down by a self-conscious understanding of these two shortcomings. He can indulge in a natural flow of fanciful humor, as when he is talking about the raggedness of his own regiment. Then his wit is spontaneous and free, but there are times when his humor is forced. At these times he becomes melancholy by too much self-pity. His impulsive answers, his backbiting the prince, and all of his irascible humors, are the result of a man who feels his own weaknesses under circumstances he cannot control.

Too often we think of Falstaff as a character whose wit overflows with fancy. He loves make-believe; feigning seems natural to him under all circumstances. And it matters not at all that Falstaff is a depraved man. Shakspere gave the same power of feigning to Iago and Richard III, both of whom are morally depraved. But to understand his cowardice we must see the other, more realistic, actions of Falstaff. When his cowardice was suddenly brought to light at the beginning of *Henry IV,* he did not feign running away. It is under such real circumstances that we feel Falstaff forcing his conscience to give way to humorous actions and talk to defend himself. His cowardice on Gadshill was due to a sudden impulse to run. This hurt Falstaff afterwards, so he lies and acts up to cover up his cowardly fright. Under quiet, thoughtful circumstances Falstaff's fancy plays naturally and spontaneously.

The rejection scene at the end of *Henry IV,* Part II, can be better understood if we examine closely the scene in which Falstaff and Prince Hal are introduced together at the beginning of Act. I, Sc. 2, of *Henry IV,* Part I. This

scene shows the true relationship between Falstaff and the Prince. After jesting about the influence of the moon and stars, Falstaff predicts that Prince Hal will have no grace when he becomes king.

> And, I prithee, sweet wag, when thou art king, as, God save thy grace, majesty, I should say, for *grace* thou wilt have none,—(I, ii).

This remark, occurring at the first appearance of Falstaff, gives the playwright's intention with regard to the relationship between these two characters. This remark is also important as explaining the rejection scene at the end of the second play, where the Prince, now king, shows a surprisingly great amount of coldness toward Falstaff.

From Falstaff's remark, we know that he expected little mercy, and at the rejection scene he passes over the king's coldness with his usual indifferency. Prince Hal in this scene throws back the same accusation at Falstaff that was used against him in the above remark:

> Make less thy body, and more thy *grace*. (*2 Henry IV*, V, v).

Falstaff says that the influence of the moon makes them men of good government; while the Prince says the "moon's men do ebb and flow like the sea . . . by the moon" (I, ii). In both places the Prince's opinions of "grace" and the moon's influence are right and Falstaff is wrong. Falstaff would have the Prince think well of them—gentlemen of the shade—when he becomes king; but the Prince more correctly sees the analogy of the moon's influence on the sea as causing the ebb and flow of the tides, like the uncertainty of stealing gold. Shakspere's introduction of Falstaff presents us a man who uses his wits to circumlocute and evade the truth. The Prince knows the nobler side of life, and the opening scene here looks far ahead—even beyond the first play to the end of the second one—to the rejection scene where the Prince, as King, rebuffs the witty knight with the truth.

As a sensitive, self-conscious man, knowing his own cowardice, sins, and bodily infirmities, Falstaff invites our sympathy and forgiveness. In spite of the lies he invents, we

see understanding and even affection in him after the Gadshill episode. At the end of it all, Falstaff says in earnestness:

> Ah, no more of that, Hal, as thou lovest me! (II, iv).

Shakspere wrote for the pit where the larger human sympathies and antagonisms kept on the surface, and the same audience which regarded Falstaff as a coward, liar, glutton, etc., could feel a pull at the hearts in places where Falstaff shows himself to be a sensitive, feeling human being.

Thus both Falstaff's cowardice and the rejection scene at the end are part of Shakspere's general plan to reveal the relationship of the Prince and Falstaff to the audience. The broad sympathy for Falstaff, which the audience feels at the beginning and end of the two plays, as well as throughout the body of them, was part of Shakspere's purpose, and not, as some critics would have us believe, simply an accident—something in the play happened, they say, which Shakspere did not intend. This opinion would take from Shakspere the credit of creating a comic hero who, in spite of his sins, has a soul. Shakspere so finely fixed Falstaff in our hearts that at the rejection scene our sympathies go along with Falstaff to the Fleet. Shakspere meant it to be so because he meant Falstaff to be a full-rounded human being. Shakspere accomplished what he aimed at.

The same intention is found in Hamlet, Lear, and the other great characters in Shakspere's plays. Hamlet is not consistently insane, nor consistently poetical; he is consistent from no one point of view. Moments of reflection, introspection, and remorse, deepen our understanding of Hamlet's mind. These moments cause the character to break through the technical strictures of the stage. The character moves forward right out of the audience, as it were, to plead its own cause. The same is true of Falstaff, and here it should be more easily appreciated because we have the boorish Falstaff of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* to compare with the true Falstaff in *Henry IV*. The difference is one of character portrayal rather than of theatrical success. In the reflective passages which present character, our whole sympathy for Falstaff immediately returns. That short recital of Dame Quickly in *Henry V* (II, (iii), telling of Falstaff's last moments on his death-bed, breathes

human sympathy, and is worth a whole play like *The Merry Wives of Windsor.*

Our sympathy for Falstaff is enhanced by two other prominent matters of characterization, one belonging to Falstaff, the other to the Prince. Although Prince Hal does not initiate the practical joke at the beginning of the play which reveals Falstaff's cowardice, he does carry it forward by teasing the knight to the point of cruelty. Practical jokers and teasers may be put into the same class with people who enjoy human suffering. Poins plans the Gadshil affair and states the upshot of his practical joke:

> The virtue of this jest will be the incomprehensible lies that this same fat rogue will tell us when we meet at supper: how thirty, at least, he fought with; what wards, what blows, what extremities he endured; and in the reproof of this lies the jest. (I, ii).

It is the Prince who actually engineers this practical joke. By cruel nagging and teasing, he works Falstaff up to an embarrassing position until he delivers the final cruel blow:

> and, Falstaff, you carried your guts away as nimbly with a quick dexterity, and roared for mercy, and still ran and roared as ever I heard bull-calf. What a slave art thou to hack thy sword as thou hast done and they say it was in fight! What trick, what device, what starting-hole, canst thou now find out to hide thee from this open and apparent shame? (II, iv).

Falstaff does not have the skin of a rhinoceros; as I have stated, his mind is sensitive and touchy. If he were callous, he would give back blow for blow. This he does under moments of retaliation, but more often, as here, the Prince's teasing makes a clown of him. He writhes under the blow and resorts to a lie in his usual way in order to squirm out of an embarrassing position.

> By the Lord, I knew ye as well as he that made ye. Why, hear ye, my masters: Was it for me to kill the heir-apparent? should I turn upon the true Prince? why, thou knowest I am as valiant as Hercules: but beware instinct; the lion will not touch the true Prince. Instinct is a great matter; I was a coward on instinct. (II, iv).

This answer reveals a type of mind which can defend itself against any unfair assault. The ease with which he fab-

ricates a lie shows Falstaff's confidence in his mental resources. There is nothing of callousness in it; it is all feeling and art. This verbal adroitness is a contrast to the comparative bluntnes of the Prince and Poins.

Because all of Falstaff's verbal adroitness affords entertainment to the audience, it is of particular interest that Falstaff's constant drinking of wine and sack be discussed here. Much of Falstaff's character grows out of his habit of drinking. Both his spirit of boldness and his spirit of meekness and compassion owe something to Bacchus. Sack and sugar enter into every mood. Whenever Falstaff enters the stage he moves and talks like one fresh from the alehouse. His attitude is more often truculent and proud, but his mind can change swiftly; he can be melancholy; and at the next moment he can give free rein to a colorful imagination.

His drinking affords much opportunity for stage play. The swaggerer drinking his wine, and talking glibly, is an old stage device, which may be used for different purposes. Shakspere in Sir Toby and Sir Andrew in *The Twelfth Night* and in the Porter in *Macbeth* shows us drunkards. Falstaff presents a contrast to Sir Toby Belch, whose mind seems to lose its awareness and alertness. Under the effects of liquor, Falstaff's mind becomes increasingly keen. Falstaff is never drunk. The frequent use of the cup on the stage by the Prince, Falstaff, and others gives the proper local color—the tavern atmosphere of the sixteenth century.

To understand Shakspere's purpose in keeping Falstaff busy with the cup, it is important to notice the first words of the Prince when Falstaff is introduced at the beginning of the play.

> Thou art so fat-witted, with drinking old sack. (I, ii).

Evidently Shakspere means us to associate the drinking of sack with Falstaff's nimble wit. When Poins first meets Falstaff, similar associations occur to his mind.

> What says Sir John Sack-and-sugar? (I, ii).
> A cup of Madeira and a cold capon's leg? (I, ii).

These remarks should not be construed as meaning that

Falstaff is a drunkard or even a toper. The evidence in Act II, sc. iv, makes the Prince and Poins themselves seem more guilty than Falstaff as indulgers of drink. Here in Boar's Head Tavern the Prince is on familiar terms with the tapsters.

> When I am King of England, I shall command all the good lads in Eastcheap. (II, iv).

To put Falstaff into the right frame of mind for his verbal combat with Prince Hal and Poins, Shakspere makes Falstaff interrupt his flowing speeches with potations of sack. We can almost see that his calling for more drink while accusing others of cowardice, is a nervous admission of his conscience that he needs liquor to fortify his lies.

> A plague of all cowards!—Give me a cup of sack, rogue. Is there no virtue extant? (II, iv).
>
> Yet a coward is worse than a cup of sack with lime in it, a villainous coward. (II, iv).
>
> Give me a cup of sack: I am a rogue, if I drunk today. (II, iv).

As a preliminary to the mock interview in the same scene, Falstaff calls for a cup of sack to stir his intellect to its best efforts.

> Give me a cup of sack, to make mine eyes look red, that it may be thought I have wept. (II, iv).

Up to this mock interview, Falstaff has indulged in cup after cup of sack; yet in no other place is Falstaff more keen intellectually. Instead of clouding his mind, he seems better prepared for the oratorical contest before him. The Prince calls him "that huge bombard of sack," but he knows better than to speak of Falstaff as drunk, because Falstaff outwits him time and again. Falstaff, like Hamlet, has magnificent powers of reasoning, and an independence of thought that is never effected by a hostile environment. The Prince knows that this mental control operates on an improved scale when the fat knight has imbibed plenteously of wine. One of the most charming utterances of Falstaff's puts his experience as a heavy drinker into a plausible philosophy. Notice the clear-cut powers of thinking revealed in this speech which occurs in Act IV, Sc. iii, line 95 ff, of the *Second Part of Henry IV*. (See below, p. 26).

So important an element is his habitual drinking, that one should think of Falstaff's character in terms of sack and sugar. It embraces every phase of his mental life, as a witty talker, as a clown, as a glutton, as a thinker, and as a man who enjoys pitying himself. It colors overything he says and does; his very personality depends on it.

Sir Sidney Lee, the great biographer, saw clearly that the greatness of Falstaff as a humorous character depended on a strain of melancholy to complete his dramatic appeal:

> "The knight's unfettered indulgence in sensual pleasures, his exuberant mendacity and love of his own ease, are purged of offence by his colossal wit and jollity, while the contrast between his old age and his unreverend way of life supplies that tinge of melancholy which is inseparable from the highest manifestations of humor." *Life of William Shakespeare,* p. 245.

This brief statement by Lee is the finest appreciation of Falstaff's character ever written. The "tinge of melancholy," whether it comes directly from the dialogue, or is derived from the circumstances surrounding Falstaff, is the key to the best understanding of his character. The fear of creeping old age makes Falstaff reflect on his bad behavior, though it does not reform him. Those about him call him Mr. Remorse, and the Prince significantly remarks at the end of a scene which provokes our compassion for Falstaff:

> Were't not for laughing, I should pity him. (II, ii).

This remark closes the exciting scene in which the Prince and Poins surprise Falstaff and his men after they have robbed the travellers. After Falstaff puts up a brief resistance, he and his men flee in a panic. The bigness of Falstaff's body and his old age contrast with the circumstances to produce a ridiculous situation. But in it all there runs a strain of compassion which we all feel. The Prince summarizes the whole situation thus:

> Fat Falstaff sweats to death,
> And lards the lean earth as he walks along:
> Wer't not for laughting, I should pity him. (II, ii).

Let us now examine closely into the more objective side of Falstaff's wit—the side that corresponds to the stage fool. We find here a melancholy that is of more worth and mean-

ing to the play than the self-pity we have noticed in Falstaff the clown. The difference between the clown's wit and the fool's wit is that the latter is intentional and, therefore, intellectual; while the clown indulges in purposeless horseplay. The melancholy that grows out of a fool's deliberate nature gives point and order to much that is spoken; yet the fool is looking at life without conscience.[1] He strips off all refinements and sees only the bare facts of animal nature. This may produce melancholy of the highest degree. Fine distinctions and delicate comparisons make up the kernel of his thinking. He is unrestrained and free because that is the avenue by which he discovers the natural causes of things. Idleness and mirth are the two sources that naturally feed his quick mind.

The fat knight easily passes at will from the clown to the fool, or vice versa. In the first scene in which Falstaff appears (I, ii), he functions as a fool, as the conversation is romantic and calculated to rival the Prince's witty remarks. The Gadshill upset, revealing Falstaff's cowardice, is nothing more than clowning, so far as Falstaff is concerned, up to Act II, Sc. iv, line 223, where he changes to a fool. From this point to the end of this scene (43 lines), Falstaff allows his constructive imagination to calculate fictitious reasons; so the intellectual wit of the fool here predominates. Generally speaking, Falstaff becomes the professional fool when the tone of his speeches rises to a romantic color well calculated for lying and defensive word-play.

Falstaff is probably not "as melancholy as a gib cat, or a lugg'd bear;" nor should he be compared to the "melancholy of Moor-ditch," as the Prince does; nor does he deserve the name "Monsieur Remorse" which Poins gives him; but the whole introductory scene, in spite of his carefree, brisk language, pictures Falstaff to us as a man infected with a tinge of decay and mutability. The sentiments about the devil, the destiny of his soul, the gallows, and the astronomical changes, all lead us to think of the melancholy spirit. Since Shakspere's workmanship in making up Falstaff was primarily for humorous purposes, the effect of this first scene on the audience works powerfully in that direction; but as we go from scene to scene through the

plays, meeting with definite traces of the same method of treatment, the idea grows on us that Falstaff is a man who is looking at the world through a veil of pessimism.

The following twenty-two different kinds of mental reaction, which, taken together, display a high intellectual type of melancholia, are quoted from *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth,* and are arranged in the order that they occur in the play. Notice the quick mental energy, the keen satisfaction in trivial things, his irritability, his self-absorption, his self-confidence, and his good[1] logic. Notice, too, the gradually fatalistic trend of his mind toward the end of the list.

I. *An Inventive Mind:*

Fal.: The brain of this foolish compound clay—man, is not able to invent anything that tends to laughter, more than I invent, or is invented on me. (I,ii).

II. *Disillusioned concerning marriage:*

Fal.: For he hath the horn of abundance, and the lightness of his wife shines through it. (I, ii).

III. *Acting Oddly:*

C. J.: Call him back again.
Ser.: Sir John Falstaff!
Fal.: Boy, tell him I am deaf.
Pa.: You must speak louder, my master is deaf. (I, ii).

IV. *Emotional Questioning:*

Fal.: What? a young knave, and begging? Is there not wars? Is there not employment? Doth not the king lack subjects? Do not the rebels need soldiers? (I, ii).

V. *Analytical Thinking; Closely Packed Thought:*

Fal.: This apoplexy, as I take it, is a kind of lethargy, an't please your lordship, a kind of sleeping in the blood, a whoreson tingling.
C. J.: What tell you me of it, be it as it is?
Fal.: It hath its original from much grief, from study, and from perturbation of the brain. I have read the cause of his effects in Galen; it is a kind of deafness. (I, ii).

[1]See above, p. 22.

VI. *Truth Parried by a Denial or Lie:*

C. J.: You have misled the youthful prince.

Fal.: The young prince hath misled me; I am the fellow with the great belly, and he my dog. (I, ii).

VII. *Reverence for the Past:*

Fal.: My lord, I was born with a white head, and something a round belly; for my voice, I have lost it with hallowing and singing of anthems. To approve my youth further, I will not: the truth is, I am only old in judgment and understanding.. I, ii).

VIII. *Disillusioned by Depravity of Man:*

Fal.: A man can no more separate age and covetousness than a' can part young limbs and lechery, but the gout galls the one, and the box pinches the other, and so both the degrees prevent my curses. (I, ii).

IX. *Unfitness to Cope with the World:*

Fal.: I can get no remedy against this consumption of the purse, borrowing only lingers it out, but the disease is incurable. (I, ii).

X. *Disobedience to Law:*

Fal.: You call honorable boldness impudent sauciness; if a man will make courtesy and say nothing, he is virtuous; no, my lord, my humble duty remembered, I will not be your suitor. (II, i).

XI. *Sense of Physical Decay:*

Fal.: Old, old, Master Shallow. (III, ii).

XII. *Witty Anaylsis of Man:*

Fal.: Will you tell me, Master Shallow, how to choose a man? Care I for the limb, the thewes, the stature, bulk and big assemblance of a man? Give me the spirit, Master Shallow. (III, ii).

XIII. *Physical Unfitness:* . .

Fal.: I have a whole school of tongues in this belly of mine, and not a tongue of them all speaks any other name but my name. An' I had but a belly of any indifference, I were simply the most active fellow in Europe; my womb, my womb, undoes me. (IV, iii).

XIV. *Sparkling Conceit:*

Fal.: But what of that? he saw me, and yielded, that I may

justly say with the hooked-nose fellow of Rome, there cousin, 'I came, saw, and overcame.' (IV, iii).

Fal.: By the Lord, I will have it in a particular ballad else, with mine own picture on the top on't (Coleville kissing my foot. (IV, ii) i

XV. *Decay of the World; Logical Analysis; Sparkling Conceit:*

Fal.: A good sherris-sack hath a two-fold operation in it; it ascends me into the brain, dries me there all the foolish, and dull, and crudy vapours which environ it, makes it apprehensive, quick, forgetive, full of nimble, fiery and delectable shaps, which, delivered o'er to the voice, the tongue, which is the birth, becomes excellent wit. The second property of your excellent sherris is the warming of the blood, which before left the liver white and pale, which is the badge of pusillanimity and cowardice; but the sherris warms it, and makes it course from the inwards to the parts extreme; it illumineth the face; which as a beacon gives warning to all the rest of this little kingdom, man, to arm, and then the vital commoners, and inland petty spirits, muster me all to their capitol, the heart, who, great and puffed up with this retinue doth any deed of courage; and this valour comes of sherris. So that skill in the weapon is nothing without sack, for that sets it a-work; and learning, a mere hoard of gold kept by a devil till sack commences it and sets it in act and use. Hereof comes it that Prince Harry is valiant; for the cold blood he did naturally inherit of his father he hath, like lean, sterile, and bare land, manured, husbanded, and tilled, with excellent endeavor of drinking good and good store of fertile sherris, that he is become very hot and valiant. If I had a thousand sons, the first human principle I would teach them should be,—to forswear thin potations, and to addict themselves to sack. (IV, iii).

XVI. *Sarcasm:*

Fal.: If I were sawed into quantities, I should make four dozen of such bearded hermits' staves as Master Shallow. It is a wonderful thing to see the semblable coherence of his men's spirits and his: they, by observing of him, do bear themselves like foolish justices; he, by conversing with them, is turned into a justice-like serving-man: their spirits are so married in conjunction with the participation of society that they flock together in consent, like so many wild geese. If I had a suit to Master Shallow, I would humor his men with the imputation of being near their master: if to his men, I would curry with Master Shallow that no man could better command his servants. It is certain that either wise bearing or ignorant carriage is caught, as men take diseases,

one of another: therefore, let men take heed of their company. I will devise matter enough out of this Shallow to keep Prince Harry in continual laughter the wearing out of six fashions,—which is four terms or two actions,—and he shall laugh without intervallums. O, it is much that a lie with a slight oath, and a jest with a sad brow, will do with a fellow that never had the ache in his shoulders! O, you shall see him laugh till his face be like a wet cloak ill laid up! (V, i, 65-89).

XVII. *Romantic Idealism:*

Pis.: I speak of Africa and golden joys.

Fal.: O base Assyrian knight! what is thy news? Let King Cophetua know the truth thereof. (V, iii).

XVIII. *Excitability:*

Fal.: I am Fortune's steward—get on thy boots, we'll ride all night. O sweet Pistol, away, Bardolph, come Pistol, utter more to me, and withal devise something to do thyself good. Boot, boot, Master Shallow! I know the young king is sick for me! Let us take any man's horses, the laws of England are at my commandment, blessed are they that have been my friends, and woe to my Lord Chief Justice! (V, iii).

XIX. *Negligence:*

Fal.: O, if I had had time to make new liveries! I would have bestowed the thousand pound I borrowed of you, but 'tis no matter, this poor show doth better, this doth infer the zeal I had to see him. (V, v).

XX. *Absolute Reasoning:*

Fal.: But to stand stained with travel, and sweating with desire to see him, thinking of nothing else, putting all affairs else in oblivion, as if there were nothing else to be done, but to see him. (V, v).

XXI. *Absolute Emotion:*

Fal.: My king, my Jove! I speak to thee, my heart! (V, v).

XXII. *Error in Judgment:*

Fal.: Do not you grieve at this, I shall be sent for in private to him: look you, he must seem thus to the world. (V, v).

Fal.: Sir, I will be as good as my word: this that you heard was but a colour. (V, v).

These twenty-two quotations, arranged in the order that they appear in *The Second Part of Henry IV,* reveal a mind as complicated and emotional, though not as intense,

as Hamlet's. The first third of these quotations deal with vital facts concerning man and his life. The second third shows a mind that thinks analytically around the subject of man's depravity and his unfitness for the world. The last third reveals a distinct fatalistic trend to Falstaff's thinking. This classification into three groups may be represented as follows:

I. Falstaff's Superior Mental Powers. I-VII.

II. Falstaff Becomes Disillusioned. VIII-XV.

III. Falstaff Sinks into Fatalistic Thinking. XVI-XXII.

Certainly the inspiration behind Falstaff's labyrinthine trains of thought and feeling comes from a fixed idea in his mind that the world has decayed. At moments, he broods and feeds upon mortality; while at other times his imagination flies high in colorful make-believe. His eloquence, as in No. XV of my list, is that of a reflective mind which would fashion its own scheme of things by giving it point and unity. The habit of putting decay in juxtaposition with an ideal conception of life is common in Falstaff as it is in Hamlet. Although the background of each is so different from the other that the directions of their thoughts are nearly opposite, the deepest emotions in both Hamlet and Falstaff are shaken by thoughts of mutability and decay.

Shakspere uses this serious strain in Falstaff to enhance the humorous side of his character. But critics are agreed that the character of Falstaff is not entirely accounted for by saying that his mind is made up of a combination of the rogue, jester and gull. The reflective element that we feel in Falstaff forms a contrast to his roguishness, and thus, as Sir Sidney Lee has pointed out,[1] the contrast aids the comic effect.

Houghton, New York

[1]See above, p. 22.

SHAKSPERE IN 1596

By A. L. EVERETT*

HOW much do we know of Shakspere? Throughout the centuries since his death he has been the subject of study for countless scholars. Every aspect of his works—for example, his stagecraft, the sources of his plays, his stock of knowledge (of Latin, French, law, music, botany, natural history, hunting lore, woodcraft)—has been exhaustively treated by specialists, while parish registers and judicial and other records have been diligently searched for details of his family connections, business transactions and law suits. Withal, the notion has persisted that Shakspere the man has eluded our grasp and that notwithstanding this mass of material, supplemented by anecdotes, monumental inscriptions and contemporary eulogies, there still cannot be evoked a living personality. Of Ben Jonson and some others of his contemporaries we are afforded a livelier impression, due either to their vanity or to dramatic circumstances in their lives. Shakspere, on the other hand, was modest and his nature was, to use a French term, équilibré; consequently we have not the like opportunity for such glimpses into his character. His life has, therefore, been a fertile field for legend and for speculation, much of it absurd, *vide* the Baconian theory. In the meantime, however, fresh contributions are being made to our stock of information, to which, it would seem, the public is not sufficiently alive. The researches of such scholars as Professor Wallace and Professor Hotson, who have not been content to thresh over old material, have brought to light, out of hitherto unexplored public archives, facts of rare value as bearing upon Shakspere's life. Out of the vast accumulation of data, old and new, it does now seem possible to obtain an impression of him somewhat less shadowy than the vague Shakspere of tradition. To achieve this a

*The author of this study was a distinguished member of the New York bar who devoted much time during the recent years of his retirement to research on Shakspere.

A graduate of Cambridge University, England, Mr. Everett took his law degree at Harvard, and practised in New York City for many years, returning to England for the last decade of his life.

Grandson of Edward Everett, statesman and educator, Alexander Leo Everett possessed a highly cultivated intelligence which was recognized both as a valuable asset to his profession and an ornament to the pursuits of his leisure.

study of a brief period of his life will be as effective as a more extended survey. By assembling all the material having to do with the given period and the application of rational inference, there may perhaps be unveiled to the reader the vision of a human Shakspere. The last half of the year 1596 and the beginning of 1597 constitute, on account of the wealth of available data, an ideal period for our purpose.

It will not be amiss to give a short sketch of his progress in the immediately preceding years. It is not until 1594, when he was thirty years old, that his personality emerges with any distinctness after a long period of obscurity. The reasons for this can only be a matter of vague conjecture, except that, latterly, the dramatic profession as a whole had suffered by the prevalence of the plague, the disorganization of the theatrical companies, and, perhaps, the tragic deaths of Kyd and Marlowe. But in 1594 the atmosphere cleared. When the clouds were dispersed the sun of Shakspere's genius was already high in the heavens, and there can be no reason for surprise that in achievement and fame he quickly made up for the lost years. In that year the company known as the "Lord Chamberlain's Men" was organized. It included Heminges, who had managerial talent of a high order, and Burbage, the leading actor of his time. Shakspere became a shareholder as well as an actor and the company's chief playwright. In this company he found the stimulus required for the development of his talents. It was an instrument probably unexcelled in the history of the stage for the production of every kind of drama and the representation of his most subtle thought and mood. The success of his *Richard III* secured him recognition as England's leading dramatist. A revival of this play and of *Titus Andronicus* marked the opening of the season 1594-5, besides the new or revised productions of *Taming of the Shrew* and *Two Gentlemen of Verona.* The next season witnessed a spectacular advance. In 1595-1596 there appeared *A Midsummer Night's Dream, Richard II* and *Romeo and Juliet.* In neither comedy, history nor tragedy had anything comparable to these been seen. From the contemporary comment it is easy to discern that they created a sensation for which it would be hard to find

a parallel in the modern drama. Not long afterwards (1598) it was written:

> "Luscus, what's playd to-day? faith now I know I set thy lips abroach, from whence doth flow Naught but pure Juliet and Romeo."
> (Marston, *The Scourge of Villainie.*)

Also, "As Plautus and Seneca are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latines; so Shakespeare among the English is most excellent in both kinds for the stage." (Meres, *Palladis Tamia.*)

At this time the booksellers, who had hitherto issued his plays anonymously, notwithstanding the great success of *Venus and Adonis* and the *Rape of Lucrece* (the former had been through four editions) began to find a profit in putting his name on title-pages (*Richard III, Richard II, Love's Labours Lost*). They even made piratical use of his name in plays by other authors. His works now occupy an important space in the literary output of the day. Out of some 130 books of every sort published in a period of two years (1597 and 1598) as listed in the Stationers' Register, including religion, politics, classics, travel, science, poetry, drama, essays and miscellaneous, nine were plays—and seven of these plays were by Shakspere.

So far no mention has been made of events in his private life. For the years preceding 1596 our information is scanty. Some scraps are available from the history of the theatrical companies in which he was engaged, and there are autobiographical hints to be found in the poems. We are not concerned with these years. Coming to 1596 let us first see what the standard biographers have to say.

> "It was probably in 1596 that Shakespeare returned after nearly eleven years' absence to his native town and very quickly did he work a revolution in the affairs of his family * * * He was no doubt at Stratford on August 11, 1596, when his only son, Hamnet, was buried in the parish church; the boy was eleven and a half years old* * * * At the same date the poet's father, despite his pecuniary embarrassments, took a step, by way of regaining his prestige, which must be assigned to the poet's intervention, he made application to the College of Heralds for a coat-of-arms." (S. Lee.)

Sir Sidney Lee was, generally speaking, cautious in venturing a conjecture but in this instance he committed an unfortunate blunder. The supposition that for nearly eleven years Shakspere neglected his wife and children is contrary to all that is known of his character and quite unsupported by evidence. Happily, in order to dispel this cruel imputation it is necessary only to go the pages of the biography itself. There are recorded the travels of the theatrical companies in which Shakspere was, or was supposed to have been, engaged, and it would appear (edition 4, page 82 note) that he was in Coventry in 1587 (twice), in 1588, 1592 and 1594. Now Coventry is only 18 miles from Stratford-on-Avon and it is incredible that he should have gone there on all these occasions without taking the opportunity to visit his famiy. Moreover the 1588 and 1592 tours included Gloucester, and Stratford-on-Avon is on the main road between Gloucester and Coventry, so that he could not have failed to pass through his native town. It must be remembered that the 300-year-old municipal records of the towns are by no means complete, and it is fair to suppose that his company would hardly miss a year in which to travel through what appears to have been the favorite theatrical circuit of that day. His other conjecture, namely that he "was no doubt at Stratford on August 11, 1596, when his only son Hamnet was "buried" is equally unhappy for, as this essay will show, there is every reason to suppose that he was traveling in Kent at that time.

His other biographer, Sir E. K. Chambers, adds somewhat, in that he finds evidence of Shakspere's professional activities for this period.

> "There is practically no external evidence to fix the date of the play (*King John*) before it is mentioned by Meres in 1598. Little stress can be laid on suggestions. * * * * that 'the choice of dauntless spirits' in 'English bottoms' made its appearance at the Cadiz expedition of 1596; perhaps not much more upon a possible echo of the death of Hamnet Shakespeare (August, 1596) in Constance's laments for Arthur. On internal grounds, however, the winter of 1596-7 is not an unlikely date for the play * * * * There are some fairly close phrasal echoes with *Merchant of Venice.*" (Chambers, *William Shakespeare,* Vol. 1, page 366).

> "If I am right, *Merchant of Venice* can hardly be later than the autumn of 1596 * * * * On general grounds of style and links

> with other plays and the *Sonnets,* the autumn of 1596 is a very probable date of the play, which is certainly more mature than the comedies of 1594-5" (page 373).
>
> "The boy Hamnet died in 1596. Sentiment would trace a reflection of the event in the sympathetic treatment of Arthur and King John, which chronology at least does not forbid." (Page 74).

This is all that the leading biographers can find to say about that year, with the exception of a single incident, buried in an appendix to Chambers, the significance of which will be disclosed as we proceed. The importance of the paragraph quoted from Chambers lies in the date given by him for *King John* and *Merchant of Venice.* In this he does not agree with Lee, who preferred an earlier date, as do other students (with reference to *King John*) who base their reckoning on metrical tests. Their theory, however, is not easily reconcilable with the known chronology of the other plays of this period, involving an excessive output by Shakspere during his experimental years and a slowing up after he had achieved success and would naturally be stimulated to increase his rate of production. Inasmuch as the chronology of Chambers is that on which this study is based it will be well to enlarge somewhat upon the reasons in support of it.

The Merchant of Venice and *King John,* in spite of their differences in theme, the one contemporary comedy, the other historical tragedy, show the sort of similarities which would mark them as nearly simultaneous productions. For instance, in the element of humor the author exploits, and develops, the vein which had proved successful in *Romeo and Juliet* the previous year. Mercutio is re-created in the Gratiano of *Merchant of Venice* and the Faulconbridge of *King John.* Swagger, loquacity and banter are the ingredients of this comedy type, qualities that are brought into relief by the chiding received from their friends, Romeo, Bassanio and King John. Gratiano and Faulconbridge both employ the trick of baiting their victim with a constantly repeated taunt: "O upright judge! Mark Jew, a learned judge!" (Gratiano)—"And hang a calfskin on his recreant limbs" (Faulconbridge). Soon Shakspere will have done with the stock humorist, and we shall see in the following spring in Falstaff, and in the host of comic characters to follow, creations which are no longer types but have dis-

tinctive personalities. Another trick of repetition has caught Shakspere's fancy at this time:

> "For I am sick and capable of fears:
> Oppressed with wrongs and therefore full of fears:
> A widow, husbandless, subject to fears,
> A woman naturally born to fears." (*King John,* Act II, Sc. 2).

> "If you did know to whom I gave this ring,
> If you did know for whom I gave the ring,
> And would conceive for what I gave the ring,
> And how unwillingly I left the ring" etc.
> (*Merchant of Venice,* Act V, Sc. 1).

It is significant, also, that he uses in *Merchant of Venice* the name Faulconbridge (the bastard of *King John*) to describe Portia's English suitor. The Neapolitan, German and Scotch suitors are not named. It was, no doubt, a bit of gag originally introduced by the actor as a reminder to the audience of the other play, which was having a contemporaneous run.

But the parallel between the two plays is chiefly remarkable in the display of nautical allusion, of which both are full. Sea terms are sparingly used in previous plays and poems, and then only as the average landsman would use them. The elaborate passage in *3 Henry VI,* Act V, Sc. 4, which contains more sea-metaphor than the rest of the early plays put together, is no exception, for it bears the mark of Shakspere's later style and was probably a part of the work of revision undertaken for the revival of the play between 1597 and 1599. The nautical allusions have now, for the first time, a vividness which reflects an actual experience with ships and the sea. Shakspere never failed to use all the resources at his command to create scenic illusion, or to enrich his metaphor, and one never has to guess whether his descriptions of places and scenes are from his own knowledge or from hearsay. He furnishes local color in abundance whenever, which is not often, the setting of his play gives him an opportunity to employ his knowledge. An example of this may be seen in *1 Henry IV,* Act IV, Sc. 2—Falstaff is marching through Shakspere's own country, so we are told the towns through which he has to go, Daventry, Coventry, Sutton-Coldfield. A more remarkable instance is *3 Henry VI,* Act V, Sc. 1, where we are intro-

duced to a number of places in Warwickshire—all in accurate relation to each other. Apart from these instances the plays are almost bare of place-allusions not essential to the plot. Where personal experience had been denied him, his ignorance was conspicuous and unashamed. His knowledge of Italy was evidently limited to what he had got from books, or talks with Florio or with some "picked man of countries * * * of the Alps and Apennines, the Pyrenean and the river Po" (*King John,* Act I, Sc 1). He imagined Verona to be a tidal port (*Two Gentlemen of Verona,* Act II, sc. 1). In his ignorance of Venice he refers to it, not as an independent republic, but as the creature of a municipal charter.

> "If you deny it, let the danger light
> Upon your charter and your city's freedom"
> (*Merchant of Venice,* Act IV, Sc. 1).

He was so indifferent about the topography of that play that Bassanio travels between Venice and Belmont by sea, Portia by land. The singularity of Venice as a city of islands and canals was probably unknown to him, otherwise he would not have failed to add some local color in the plays having to do with it. In fact, there is not in *The Merchant* a single bit of place-description, except of the Goodwin Sands, in the English Channel, which will be referred to later.

One cannot fail to notice, by contrast with previous plays, how sparkling are his descriptions of the sea:

> "How like a younker or a prodigal
> The scarfëd bark puts from her native bay,
> Hugged and embracëd by the strumpet wind;
> How like a prodigal doth she return
> With overwreathëd ribs and raggëd sails,
> Lean, rent and beggar'd by the strumpet wind."
> (*Merchant,* Act II, Sc. 6.).

> "The tackle of my heart is crackt and burst,
> And all the shrouds wherewith my life should sail
> Are turnëd to one thread, one little hair;
> My heart hath one poor string to stay it by."
> (*King John,* Act V, Sc. 7).

> "And like a shifted wind unto a sail,
> It makes the course of thoughts to fetch about."
> (*King John,* Act IV, Sc. 2).

Reading these passages, one must infer, bearing in mind that there is nothing like them in previous plays, that he had had a new and recent experience of seeing ships under sail. Where had he obtained it? We find the clue in the history of his company's provincial travels. As the result of the industry of J. T. Murray and others much information about them has been collected, for the most part from the municipal archives of the towns where the company played, it being the custom in those days to encourage the visits of theatrical companies by paying them a guaranteed wage out of municipal funds. In 1596, the year in question, the theatres of London were closed in July by order of the city authorities, and their companies were, therefore, obliged to go on tour. The available information for that summer in connection with Shakspere's company consists of a single engagement at Faversham about Lammas Day, the beginning of August. The entry in the Municipal accounts of Faversham reads: "Item, payde to mye Lorde of Hunsdouns Players about Lamas bye thappoyntmente of Mr. Saker" (Chambers, Appendix D, Vol. 2, p. 321). Shortly before this date, upon the death of the Lord Chamberlain, the patronage of the company had been taken over by his son, Lord Hunsdon. The company was thereupon and until the following spring, when Hunsdon became Lord Chamberlain, known as Lord Hunsdon's men. It is thus that they are described in the Faversham municipal accounts. Chambers appears to be doubtful whether the year of the Faversham visit was 1596 or 1597, but clearly it was 1596. The August of that year was the only August in which the company were known as Lord Hunsdon's men, for in the following year they resumed their title "Lord Chamberlain's Men" as appears in the records of all the towns in which they played in 1597. Faversham is a seaport at the mouth of the Swale on the Thames estuary, about 50 miles from London, the road passing through Gad's Hill and Rochester. (Localities utilized for scenes in *1 Henry IV* in the following year). Its inhabitants at that time numbered only about 1400, but their civic spirit was noteworthy. There are memorials on the walls of the parish church recording, for that period, numerous benefactions to the town; among such was one by William Saker, whose will, made in 1594, bequeathed £10 yearly to the poor of Faversham, and £5 yearly to the use

of a lecture in the church of Faversham. One may guess that it was this Saker who was the moving spirit in the invitation to Shakspere's company. Faversham was, and still is, attached as a "limb" to Dover, one of the Cinque ports, distant about 24 miles overland. On requisition by the Crown, it furnished in 1588 40 tons of the 100 tons of shipping required of Dover, and in 1596 40 tons of the 160 tons similarly required. Its interests were wholly maritime. The market place, town hall and inns were all within two or three hundred yards of the water front. If, as we must suppose, Shakspere traveled with his company, he found himself at a place where, in his leisure, he could watch the going and coming of ships and associate with seamen. He was sensitive and observant, and it is not possible that he could have escaped the influence of this environment. There was good reason, therefore, to associate with this tour the sudden improvement which we observe in his knowledge of the sea, of ships and of sailors' idiom.

But in both plays there is evidence that his tour extended, beyond Faversham, to the south coast and that he had received a lively impression of its chalk cliffs and of the Goodwin Sands. He had already spoken of England's "chalky çliffs" (*Comedy of Errors,* Act III, sc. 2; *2 Henry VI,* Act III, sc. 2). This was a dull, second-hand description. Now they become

> "That pale, that white-faced shore
> Whose foot spurns back the ocean's roaring tides
> And coops from other lands her islanders."
> (*King John,* Act I, Sc. 2).

More vivid still is his description of the Goodwin Sands.

> "That Antonio hath a ship of rich lading wrecked on the narrow seas: the Goodwins I think they call the place, a very dangerous flat and fatal, where the carcases of many a tall ship lie buried, as they say, if my gossip report be an honest woman of her word."
> (*Merchant,* Act III, Sc. 1).

> "And I should think of shallows and of flats,
> And see my wealthy Andrew docked in sand,
> Vailing her hightop lower than her ribs
> To kiss her burial." (*Merchant,* Act 1, Sc. 1).

Here were scenes which he had witnessed, reproduced for his audience while the impression was fresh. They are

plainly digressions, ill-suited to the text, for which he had trouble in finding an appropriate setting. The description of Dover Cliffs, in *King John,* is put in the mouth of Austria, who could scarcely have been familiar with them, and certainly, as an enemy of England, was not the one to describe them admiringly. The reference in *The Merchant* to the Goodwin Sands, in order to come plausibly from a Venetian, is introduced rather awkwardly through the contrivance of "gossip report."

We are, therefore, led to inquire under what circumstances Shakspere visited the south coast. It has been ascertained that he was at Dover on or about September 3d, 1597, but that was the year succeeding the production of the two plays. The record of this visit is to be seen in the archives of Dover in municipal accounts for that year. They are now bound up in a volume containing ancient accounts for a great number of years. But the accounts for the year 1596 are missing, destroyed (in common with those of other years), owing to the carelessness of custodians in the remote past. Nor are they to be found in the British Museum, to which a number of Dover records have found their way. In the absence of a further record of the company's itinerary in 1596 we are justified in assuming that it visited other towns besides Faversham. Of these one of the most likely was Dover. It is impossible to suppose that they traveled some 50 miles, with but a single engagement at a town of 1400 inhabitants, to return immediately afterwards and disband in London. They had to earn their living. A success at Faversham would have assured them a welcome to the affiliated town of Dover with whose authorities, as the municipal records show, the jurats (aldermen) of Faversham were in constant communication over their joint naval contributions. Their good friend Mr. Saker would have seen to it they had a proper introduction. At Dover, no doubt, they would have found a public of sufficient importance to assure them substantial takings.

We may conjecture, therefore, that the recorded employment of 1597 at Dover was a repeat engagement, due to their success there in the previous year. What makes this the more probable is that the 1597 visit to Dover, together with one at Rye, was squeezed in, probably with some dif-

ficulty, after the close of the London season, and before engagements of which we have a record at Bristol and other western towns in the month of September. Here, then, at Dover and further east, perhaps at Deal, a town which had recently grown to importance, he received those impressions which are reflected in the two plays. It was then that he observed the sea and the coast and, curiously enough, we can conjecture the exact extent of his observations on that occasion, for it was not until nine years later, in 1605, when his company's next visit to Dover is recorded, that he could have made the excursion to the summit of Dover cliffs, which was to inspire the famous passage in *King Lear,* Act IV, sc. 6, produced in the season of 1605-1606. We may conclude, then, that the month of August, 1596, was spent in a tour beginning at Faversham and extending to the south coast of Kent.

But it is not alone for the light which it throws upon his knowledge and his art that this tour is important. It has an especially romantic relation to the play of *King John.* It will be remembered that the event which darkened this year of Shakspere's life was the death of his son Hamnet, about August 11th. This loss is commonly supposed to have inspired him in the creation of Little Arthur of *King John,* and the most austere critics concede that the popular view has some justification. If the following observations be sound the conjecture is abundantly justified.

Whatever the reason for the choice of the *Troublesome Raigne* as a source from which to make a play, it is certain that he found in it material suitable to his mood. But in undertaking this task he was confronted with more than a mere revision. English drama had, in a decade, undergone a great development. The old play was too crude, in matter and in versification, for presentation to an audience of that day. He found himself committed to a formidable task, nothing less than a complete rewriting of it. King John proved to be less congenial to him as a hero than Richard III or Richard II, less susceptible to subtle delineation. All his passion is thrown into the scenes in connection with Prince Arthur. These are, as Sir Sidney Lee has observed, among the most poignant in all Shaksperian drama. One passage in particular deserves to be quoted, because it is

that which most clearly represents Shakspere's own sensation of loss. Its significance has escaped the critics, who have not perceived its relation to Shakspere, in pointing to his absence from Stratford at the time of Hamnet's death.

Constance is lamenting the capture of her son by King John:

> "And, father cardinal, I have heard you say,
> That we shall see and know our friends in heaven:
> If that be true, I shall see my boy again:
> For, since the birth of Cain, the first male child,
> To him that did but yesterday suspire,
> There was not such a gracious creature born.
> But now will canker-sorrow eat my bud,
> And chase the native beauty from his cheek,
> And he will look as hollow as a ghost;
> As dim and meagre as an ague's fit;
> And so he'll die; and, rising so again,
> When I shall meet him in the court of heaven
> I shall not know him: therefore never, never,
> Must I behold my pretty Arthur more."
>
> (Act III, sc. 4).

This is fresh matter, not suggested by any passage in the source play. What he had to work on were the following wretched lines:

> "Two words will serve and then my tale is done:
> Elinor's proud brat robb'd me of my son."

The reader should observe in the Shaksperian passage the nature of the mother's premonition, that Arthur will die slowly and from a wasting disease. But in the sequel her foreboding is not fulfilled. Shakspere knew, as his audience did, that Arthur's was not to be a lingering death. He was to die, shortly afterwards, by throwing himself from a wall. Here was a solecism which dramatic propriety forbids, and Shakspere was too much of an artist not to be sensible of it. In the realm of romance prophecies should come true. Indeed, in the same play we find another instance of prophecy—Pandulph's (Act III, sc. 4) duly followed by its accomplishment (Act IV, sc. 2). This vision of Constance, incongruous with the plot, was, one can only suppose, introduced deliberately, because it was that which was torturing Shakspere, inspired by the circumstances of his own tragedy, his tour in a distant part of England having precluded his return to Stratford until

after many months of absence, during which his son had sickened and died. The eternal problem—In what form shall we be revealed to each other in the "court of heaven"?—which perplexed Constance, was inevitably one which would haunt Shakspere, vainly conjuring up a picture of his dying child.

The year, however, was not to close without still further troubles. The closing of the theatres, in July, of which mention has been made, was an arbitrary proceeding of the London authorities, induced probably by the growing Puritan sentiment hostile to the players. It synchronized with the death of the Lord Chamberlain, Lord Hunsdon, a kinsman of the Queen and patron of Shakspere's company, who had been their efficient champion. His successor in the office of Chamberlain was Lord Cobham, who did not regard the drama with favor. The situation was so serious with the actors that Tom Nashe was moved to write:

> "Now the players are piteously persecuted by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen and however in their old Lord's time they thought their state settled, it is now so uncertain that they cannot build upon it."

The prospect for the next season in the City proper appearing so dubious, Shakspere's company sought to obtain a theatre across the river and entered upon some arrangement with Langley, who had built the Swan Theatre, to find a home there. Here again they met with fierce opposition. The full story is told by Professor Hotson, who discovered the court rolls recording the dispute, in his volume entitled *Shakespeare versus Shallow*. It appears that one Gardiner, a magistrate, endeavored to obstruct Langley's enterprise. There were threats of physical violence, each side appealing to the court for protection against the other. Shakspere, who took an active part in the matter, was made a defendant in one of these suits. What the outcome was we do not know. Evidently, some theatre was found for the forthcoming busy and brilliant season, but as a result of the quarrel, taken in connection, no doubt, with his previous difficulties, Shakspere went through a phase of discontent. It is something more than a coincidence, to which hitherto no critic has called attention, that Shakspere, at this juncture, made the momentous decision to adopt, as soon as

his means permitted, the life of a country gentleman. This involved two steps, to acquire a property and to be invested with the arms of a gentleman. He endeavored forthwith to carry out this plan. We may be sure that the purchase of New Place at Stratford-on-Avon, which was consummated in May of the following year had been projected at this time. He could not have spent much time for negotiation during the winter and spring, the busiest period of the theatrical season. The proceedings to acquire land by way of Fine were cumbersome and the conveyancers of that period were certainly not less dilatory than those of today. The negotiations could hardly have been begun later than the early winter.

His plan, clearly, was to retire to Stratford as soon as he had gained a competence and to leave a scene where, brilliant as his triumph had been, an influential and growing section of the community condemned his profession as disgraceful and he was subjected to oppression and humiliation. In the sequel these annoyances were removed or at any rate alleviated. Happily he was only thirty-two years of age and had abundant enthusiasm. The despairing mood was only momentary. Greater triumph to come obliterated the memory of the difficult year 1596, and many years were to pass before he came to realize, in ease and with a sense of his task completed, a project which had its origin in bitterness and disappointment.

A BIOGRAPHY OF AUTOLYCUS

By CHRISTINE WHITE

LIKE so many of Shakspere's characters—like the gravediggers in *Hamlet,* like Dogberry and Verges—Autolycus, in *The Winter's Tale,* is the dramatist's deliberate addition to his source; for Greene's *Pandosto,* on which the play is based, does not contain even a remote analogue to him. In the three scenes in which Autolycus appears, he dominates and vivifies the dialogue. One may properly ask out of what materials Shakspere created this character, and why he interpolated him in a play already so decentralized and diverse. Although Bulthaupt[1] implies that Shakspere made up Autolycus out of his imagination, and although Hartley Coleridge[2] also suggests that Autolycus is an expression of the poet's "philosophic depth", yet most critics take him, not as an abstract and purely imaginative invention, but as "all English"[3] of the Elizabethan age, as a realistic portrait of a "most admirable rascal"[4] who "inimitably"[5] portrays the low life of the day—indeed, the very "incarnation of rascality";[6] and even Professor Stoll, who is not inclined to see realism in Elizabethan drama, calls him "one of the merry rogues of Shakespeare and his time."[7] Autolycus, in fact, reflects not only the outward vivid details of Elizabethan low life, but also, in the biography of himself that he sketches in scattered places, he glimpses the social causes and the conditions that governed such a life, and made it all too common in Elizabethan England. In his past and in his present courses, Autoclycus, indeed, reflects materials borrowed from four strata of Elizabethan life, the court, minor officialdom, the artisan, and the rogue.

Autolycus, in his several pithy reminiscences, seems to give a rather full sketch of his previous career. Apparently, at the beginning of this career, he had "served Prince Florizell" and worn "three-pile"[8] velvet; and this implies that, like Falstaff, he was a page, and later presumably a gentleman servingman,[9] like Fabyan in *Twelfth Night.*[10] "Three-pile" velvet, indeed, does not suggest that he "served Prince Florizell" in any menial capacity, and since personal attendants of royalty, and even of the no-

bility, in the sixteenth century were regularly of gentle birth—the Renaissance successors of the feudal retainers of the Middle Ages—Autolycus' position, presumably marks him as a gentleman. Little wonder, then, that he could put on at will the "ayre," the "gate," and the "measure"[11] of the *"beau monde,* become, in fact, for the nonce, a courtier cap-a-pe,"[12] and offer his services as "Advocate"[13] before the king. Autolycus may well have been, like Orlando,[14] a younger son of some county family, whom the economic duress of the age had forced to remain in service even after his time of apprenticeship as a page was over. Although the old system of Medieval retainers and servingmen was breaking down and vulgar interlopers like Launcelot Gobbo were assuming fine clothes together with the airs and graces of their betters-in-service, yet, such could hardly have penetrated to the *entourage* of a prince of the blood royal; Autolycus, therefore, must surely have been gently born. As page and servingman, Autolycus would have been "lapt in liverie",[15] and this livery might well have been of "three-pile," which, having a threefold accumulation of the outer surface, was the richest and most costly velvet—such material as gave to the mercer in *Measure for Measure* his name of Master Three-pile. This livery, no doubt, was the unique invention of his Master's fancy, and "told without asking"[16] who owned him. Thus both man and clothing were the "makings up of a gentleman" and were wholly his "masters", were of his "faction", of his "cut" and of his "pleasures."[17] Hetherington's inference that Autolycus may have been a jester because his songs and witticisms would have "found favor in any court", is hardly probable; for servingmen also entertained their masters with "courting language" and "bawdy jests", and were "ready furnished with a song."[18] Three-pile velvet, moreover, suggests a servingman rather than a professional fool. Autolycus admits, without explanation or excuse, that he was "whipt out of court."[19] In an age when masters used any pretext, even the "breaking of a bulrush",[20] to "relieve themselves of one more hungry mouth",[21] when the law permitted them to whip a servant twice[22] for one trivial[23] offense, Autolycus might have been unjustly punished; but Florizell's opulence as prince of the realm, as well as his kindly personality, suggest that the whipping was deserved; and Autolycus' later life intimates that, even

when a servingman, he may have had among his other "Vertues"[24] that of snapping-up "unconsidered trifles."[25] Autolycus is Shakspere's final glance at the servant problem of Jacobean England[26]—a problem that in earlier plays he treated again and again. Beginning with Launce and Grumio, and progressing through Launcelot Gobbo, Malvolio, and Pompey, these figures show an increasing sophistication; Autolycus, the latest, is, perhaps, the most sophisticated of them all. Shakspere's earlier servingmen, moreover along with their rustic naiveté are characteristically loyal, despite ill-treatment; but the whipping that Autolycus received casts a *prima facie* doubt on his naiveté and on his faithfulness to his master.

His three-pile velvet lost, Autolycus, according to his life-story as related to the Clown, was "an ape-bearer, then a process-server (a Bayliffe), then he compast a motion of the Prodigall sonne, and married a Tinkers wife, . . . and (having flown over many knavish professions) he settled onely in Rogue."[27] This last somewhat general term of "Rogue," the Clown later explains in some detail by calling Autolycus a "Prig," that is, a petty thief, one who "haunts Wakes, Faires and Bear-baitings."[28] What each of these "professions" signified appears clearly in contemporary books and pamphlets. If Autolycus' statement is chronologically correct, his first means of livelihood was the despised business of "ape-bearer." Sir Thomas Overbury declared that "nothing on earth" was "more pittifull" than "an ape-bearer."[29] This career of Autolycus, however, probably lasted only until some relative had him appointed bailiff and thus in some degree retrieved the family standing. [30] Bayliffe, or sergeant,[31] in Elizabethan times was a general term for a petty officer of the low courts. Autolycus was of better social position than the average petty officer, but he was probably just as "negligent" and corrupt."[32] He did not need Dogberry's advice to permit a thief—for a price—"to steal out of his company;"[33] for, presumably, he knew the value of such "conniving."[34] His nose, like that of the bailiff of Lancashire, was doubtless "richly rubefied"[35] by free drinks accepted in lieu of greater bribes; and he may well have been one of those numerous process-servers who, "when they were sent to arrest a man," would give him warning in hopes of re-

ceiving appropriate "gratitude."[36] According to the usage of the time, Autolycus probably exchanged threats and blows for many a prisoner's "cloak, sword, or hat," made lean many a "fat purse"[37] and let any vagabond at the "cart's tail,"[38] whose "gratitude" was sufficient, escape his punishment with unbloodied back. Indeed, the career of Autolycus, as a minion of justice might have taught him much of the chicanery of his later life. Little wonder that "beating and hanging"[39] were terrors to him, who, as bailiff, probably had administered both; and little wonder that he flew over "many knavish professions" before "he settled only in rogue."[40]

How Autolycus lost his position as bailiff, the play does not explain; but he next became a puppet-showman, the "maker" of a "motion" of a "Prodigall sonne," a successor of the "old Mysteries" that were still popular.[41] Then, a more "knavish profession" offering, Autolycus gave up the motion show, and "married a Tinkers wife,"[42] presumably to secure her late husband's equipment. Countrymen had long welcomed tinkers as useful artisans, and the trade had become "a common cloak for rogues."[43] Autolycus' training seems especially to have fitted him for it. Although tinkers, like servingmen, were never at a loss for a song, which they accompanied by the beat of a hammer on a tin pan,[44] Autolycus' songs, rendered with the "ayre" of the court, must have been particularly entertaining; and his use of Cock Lorel's chant, "Ha you any work for a tinker,"[45] probably brought both legitimate trade and illegal "booty."[46] At the approach of a prospective "gull," Autolycus, no doubt, "cast his profession in a ditch,"[47] and, like a certain brother-in-trade, perhaps even robbed on the highway, "four palliards[48] and two rogues."[49] Autolycus would rather steal than "beg!"[50] but, when stealing became too dangerous, he would leave his tinker's bag at the alehouse and go "abroad a-begging."[51] His tongue, sharpened by court jests, must have made him a noted "linguist" even among tinkers, who were supposed to be "very valuable."[52] The many measures of ale that Autolycus, as a process-server, had consumed must have given him the capacity for the "bene bowse"[53] that was a requisite of "tippling tinkers,"[54] and that produced their "choleric nature."[55] As a "knavish" artisan, therefore, the former servingman and

bailiff under "colour" of "a little work," finished his course in "picking and stealing,"[56] and so graduated in full to master of roguery.

Autolycus, fallen from courtier to rogue, illustrates the various activities of that vast company of vagabonds, produced by a changing social system, who "packed the towns and haunted the countryside."[57] In the play, he first appears as a prigman, singing a naughty song that mentions the attraction to his "pugging tooth" of a "white sheete bleaching on a hedge," and his joy in the "quart of ale" for which this sheet might be exchanged; and doubtless with a sly *double entendre,* he admits that his "Traffic is sheetes."[58] His song is very like that of the prigman, Tom Beggar, Wily Will, and Simplicity:

> Our fingers are lime twigs, and barbers we be,
> To catch sheetes from hedges most pleasant to see,
> Then to the ale-wife, roundly we set them to sale,
> And spend the money merrily upon her good ale.[59]

Instead of his bailiff's mace, or his tinker's pen and hammer, Autolycus now carried a "filch," or cane, that he used to kill "a pig," a sheep, a duck, or a goose to furnish his own and his doxy's table; or he might "beat a man by the highway for the money in his purse;"[60] or by slipping an iron hook into the hole in one end of the cane, he converted it into a "filching-staff" with which he angled for "shirts, smocks, and any other linen or woolen"[61] visible on hedges or in houses. Autolycus may well have belonged to a fraternity of rogues[62] whose tenth commandment was "Thou shalt take clothes, hens, geese, pigs, bacon, and suchlike for thy winnings, wherever thou canst have them."[63] Since he was not a "wild rogue," a rogue by birth, he must originally have been "stalled to the order," paid "a dozen of beer" as an initiation fee, and so permitted to practice in accordance with established laws and customs.[64] His appearance at the sheep-shearing probably was not by chance; for rogues attended fairs and all rural celebrations[65] like "swarms of locusts;"[66] and there "buyers and sellers" alike were "rascals" who sold clothing they had previously "pilfered" or who enacted "new warm orders for fresh stealing of clothes."[67]

When Autolycus came to Perdita's festival, however, he

planned to rise in the world from mere prigman to pick-pocket. Meeting by the way "a prize"[68] in the person of the Clown who, he perceived, lacked "but something to be a reasonable man,"[69] he assumed the common rôle of the "counterfeit crank;" and for the purpose of arousing remunerative sympathy, he feigned unjustly to have received a "million mightie" stripes.[70] While the kindly rustic helped him to his feet, Autolycus picked his pocket, and, offering an old story of "a kinsman not past three quarters of a mile hence,"[71] departed to put on his "pedlar's excrement,"[72] hoping in this guise to be welcomed at the shearing.

Autolycus' change of "ayre" as well as of "excrement," perhaps, assured his welcome. The cringing "counterfeiter" of a moment past approached the festivity a merry pedlar, singing about a "Smocke" as though it "were a shee-angell"[73] and chanting ballads "as he had eaten them;" and "all men's eares grew to his Tunes."[74] The wealth of the pedlar's sack: the white lawn, black cypress, the "gloves, maskes, bugle bracelets, perfume, golden Quoifs and Stomachers,"[75] did not attract even Mopsa, so sensational were these "news-ballads"[76] of "Monstrous Births . . . Judgments of God and other Prodigious and Fearful Happenings,"[77] all attested, as was the custom, by several eye witnesses.[78] Such ballads with "Love-songs for Maids," strangely without bawdrie," and an Elizabethan jig in which Dorcas and Mopsa each "bore a part"[79] have numbed "all other senses,"[80] and thus enabled the roguish minstrel "in this time of Lethargie" to pick and cut "most of their Festivall Purses."[81] Since printing "had killed"[82] the Minstrelsy of the Middle Ages and since balladry had risen to such a vogue that "whoever was hanged or burnt, a merry, or a lamentable ballad . . . was immediately entered in the books of the company of Stationers,[83] the ballad-singers, such as Autolycus "wandered up and down the land,"[84] exchanging entertainment for filched purses. Like most of these singing pedlars, Autolycus was a "most deep cutpurse," one of many who derived so great "benefit" from "pageant days, great market days and ballad places,"[85] that the loss of a purse "seemed as intimate a part of London as its fog."[86] Usually the thief had a ballad-monger as his accomplice,[87] who held the attention of the crowd while he

picked pockets; but Autolycus effectively combined both rôles; with his "good Nose," he smelled "out worke for the other senses," sang the crowd into a "lethargie," and combined the professions of cutpurse and pickpocket, of despised "Nip" and of "Gentleman Foist."[88] Thus "Shakespeare's contribution" to "Elizabethan ballad-mongers,"[89] was, indeed, a "prince of quicksilver rogues"[90] who had all the "traditional" tricks and "more besides."[91]

When Shakspere added Autolycus to a romantic play of strange people in foreign lands, caught in an extraordinary tangle of circumstances, he added a bit of everyday life of contemporary England; for the strange and the extraordinary lose their effect unless there is the realistic and commonplace to supply adequate contrast. Autolycus, the servingman, in his three-pile velvet was of an old and honored class; the servingman "whipt out of court" was of the new but large company of "cast" servants, many of them of the gentry, who, left without means of livelihood, turned sooner or later, to the highways for a living.[92] Autolycus, the apebearer, was one of a despised army of drifters: "ballad-mongers" with "crazy lutes," "bearwards" leading "many bears," jugglers, tinkers, and petty "chapmen" with any excuse for "sheer vagabondage."[93] Autolycus, the Bailiff, was one of many younger sons making a vain attempt to remain a gentleman. Autolycus, the maker of motions, was a small part of the drama of England's most dramatic age. Autolycus, the tinker, was one of many rogues, working under cover of the artisan's cloak, who made travel dangerous,[94] and Autolycus, the rogue, who, with "genial boldness" turned "every situation to use,"[95] and, to the "delight of his audience," cheated his "gulls" and "coneys" whose only fault was their "rusticity"[96]—such an Autolycus must have been "applauded ecstatically"[97] by audiences that knew their own danger from such rogues, and by people who, as a natural result of an age of "expansion," generally "cherished" a belief in the "possibility and advisability of getting something for nothing."[98]

Although Shakspere's introduction of Autolycus into *The Winter's Tale* affects the plot but little, it is significant. Autolycus supplies music and humor to an otherwise somber play; his piquant Elizabethan gusto makes Per-

dita's feast not an unreal "assemblage of deities"[99] but a true contemporary folk festival; and he distracts the spectator's minds from the improbability of the denouement. As lightly as this rogue picked pockets, so lightly did Shakspere sketch him into the story, and as swiftly as he, on occasion, changed tricks and guises, so swiftly did the dramatist use him to glimpse varying social planes and problems that in earlier plays he had portrayed in more detail. Autolycus' situation as a destitute younger son was analogous with Orlando's;[100] as a "cast" servingman, he was cousin to Malvolio, in *Twelfth Night,*[101] and to Lear's discharged retainers; as a constable, he was of the company of Dull, Dogberry and Elbow.[102] Autolycus, the ape-bearer, and the "maker-of-motions," shows the dubious social rank of the strolling players in *Hamlet*—such players as the magistrate legally whipped twice;[103] and as a rogue, rivals the great Falstaff himself.[104] In his descent from court to vagabondia, Autolycus reveals, indeed, nearly all these causes and conditions of life in transition from feudal to modern society, and so gives to *The Winter's Tale* an especially Elizabethan touch.

Autolycus, who speaks only two hundred-sixty-eight lines, is no mean rival of Falstaff with his one thousand-two hundred-ninety-nine. He exhibits more phases of roguery than Pistol, Nym and Bardolph, and has, at least, all the complexity of Falstaff. Like Falstaff, he is the unusual combination of aristocrat and sharper; like Falstaff, he is devoid of conscience; and like him, enjoys roguery for the sake of roguery. Both are witty; Falstaff more often perhaps, but Autolycus with a delicacy of perception that his predecessor hardly reaches. In cunning he is, at least, equal to the fat rogue; and in bravery his clever profession that he is "false of heart"[105] paves the way for audacious deeds that mark him as the superior of the cowardly knave who believed that "the better part of valour is discretion."[106] Autolycus, the vagabond, who, "mellowed by a touch of poetry,"[107] cannot but "set his cozenage to music,[108] is as lovable, if not as famous, as his companion in dramatic roguery. Falstaff, whose "very size" for a time "floats him" out of "difficulties,"[109] finally appears in a state of decadence; whereas Autolycus, with all the airy lightness of his character, sails off "successful and unharmed,"[110] plot-

ting once more to make a victim of the simple Clown.[111].

Although Ben Jonson in *Bartholomew Fair* used Ezechiel Edgeworth, a cutpurse, Nightingale, a ballad-singer, Don Jordon Knockem, a horse-courser, Lathorn Leatherhead, a pedlar, and Trouble-all, a Madman, as representatives of the low-life of his day, none of his characters equals in complexity or realism Shakspere's Autolycus. Neither is Brome's Moneylacks, "a needy knight that lives by shifts,"[112] a serious rival of the human Autolycus. Perhaps Beaumont and Fletcher's "Princes of the ragged regiment,"[113] Higgen, Ferret, Prig, and Snap, are his more worthy brothers in vagabondia. They sing, feign, beg, and "steal from the hedge both the shirt and the sheet."[114] As low-born rogues, however, they lack the diversity of activities and the artistry of vagabondage with which Shakspere endowed his aristocratic sharper.

Some critics find in Autolycus merely the continuance of a stage convention; and roguery has delighted the theatre at least since the figure of Dossennus in the Roman farces. Indeed, Shakspere might have had *Dives Pragmaticus* in mind when he created Autolycus, but he more probably took such a "list of articles for sale"[115] from the common street cries of just such mischievous vendors as actually frequented Elizabethan towns and fairs. Autolycus may be a "lineal descendant" of the Vice of the old Morality plays. His disguises as "countryman," pedlar, and courtier to evade the law and "to pursue his own nefarious business" may be "a little like" the Vice, Idleness, in *Wit and Wisdom,* who deceives the constable by appearing first as rat-catcher, then as priest. His pedlar's song may be similar to Nicol Newfangle's "Trim Merchandise" ditty in *Like Will To Like,* and his cry "Ha, ha, what a fool honesty is"[116] may mark him as the Vice who made "a fool of honesty;"[117] but if Shakspere conceived of Autolycus as the "lineal descendant" of such a stock figure, he moulded his character in the pattern of sixteenth-century England, and drew his lineaments, as he drew those of Falstaff, in the likeness of contemporary English roguery.

West Virginia University
Richmond, W. Va.

[1]H. Bulthaupt, *Dramaturgie der Klassiker,* Oldenburg, 1884, 378.
[2]H. Coleridge, *Essays and Marginalia,* London, 1851, 148.
[3]C. G. Osgood, *The Voice of England,* New York, 1935, 191.
[4]H. Giles, *Human Life in Shakespeare,* Boston, 1863, 199.
[5]A. W. Schlegel, *Lectures,* tr. Black, London, 1815, 181.
[6]F. J. Furnivall, *Leopold Shakespeare,* London, 1877, xcii.
[7]E. E. Stoll, *Shakespeare Studies,* New York, 1927, 480.
[8]*The Winter's Tale,* ed. Furness var., IV, iii, 15-16.
[9]T. W. Baldwin, *Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company,* Princeton, N. J., 1927, 246.

If Professor Baldwin is right in suggesting that possibly John Lowin played the part of Autolycus in the revival of *Winter's Tale* in 1611, this would suggest that Autolycus, like Falstaff and Iago, which Lowin also played, was thought of as essentially a soldier; for such a conception of Autolycus as a soldier out of employment, and out of favor at court, is entirely consistent with his having been a servingman; for servingmen were, among other things, the armed retainers of their lords.

[10]J. W. Draper, "Olivia's Household," *P. M. L. A.,* XLIX, 802.
[11]*Winter's Tale,* ed. cit., IV, iv, 819, *et seq.*
[12]*Ibid.,* IV, iv, 823.
[13]*Ibid.,* IV, iv, 828, *et passim.*
[14]J. W. Draper, "Orlando, The Younger Brother," *P. Q.,* XIII, 73.
[15]G. Markham, *Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Serving Men,* in *Inedited Tracts,* ed. Hazlitt, Roxb. London, 1614, 108.
[16]T. Overbury, *Characters,* "Servingman," London, 1614, 108.
[17]J. Earle, *Microcosmography,* "Servingman," London, 1628.
[18]T. Overbury, *op. cit.,* 108.
[19]*The Winter's Tale, ed. cit.,* IV, iii, 91-92.
[20]Markham, *op cit.,* 133.
[21]Basse, *Sword and Buckler,* London, 1602, stanza 10; R. Brathwait, *English Gentleman,* London, 1641, 86-89.
[22]C. Viner, *General Abridgement of Law and Equity,* "Master and Servant," XV, 319.
[23]M. Bacon, *New Abridgement,* "Master and Servant," Phil., 1811, 592.
[24]*Winter's Tale, ed. cit.,* IV, iii, 90-91.
[25]*Ibid.,* IV, iii, 28.
[26]J. W. Draper, "Shakespeare's Rustic Servants," *Shak.,* 122, LXIX, 87, *et seq.*
[27]*Ibid.,* IV, iii, 97, *et passim.*
[28]*Ibid.,* IV, iii, 103-4.
[29]Overbury, *op. cit.,* "Rymer."
[30]*Cf.* J. W. Draper, "Orlando, The Younger Brother," *P. Q.,* XIII, 73.
[31]Schmidt, *Shakespeare Lexicon,* S.V.
[32]Louise D. Frasure, "Shakespeare's Constables,"*Anglia.* XLVI, 384, *et seq.*
[33]*Much Ado,* III, iii, 57.
[34]R. Brome, introductory poem in Mill, *A Night's Search,* 1640, Sig. A3.
[35]Wm. Fennor, *The Counter's Commonwealth,* London, 1617, 461.
[36]*Ibid.,* 461.
[37]*Ibid.,* 460, *et. sequ.*
[38]2 Henry VIII, c. 12, in Judges, *Elizabethan Underworld,* xxxiv.
[39]*Winter's Tale,* IV, iii, 31.
[40]*Ibid.,* IV, iii, 100-1.
[41]*The Spectator,* No. 14, in *Winter's Tale,* 177.
[43]Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds,* Oxford, 1913, 42.
[44]Overbury, *op. cit.,* "Tinker."
[45]Markall, *Beadle of Bridewell,* London, 1610, 420.
[46]*Ibid.,* 420.
[47]*Ibid.,* 420.
[48]The "palliard" was a variation of the "counterfeit crank" who made artificial sores by the application of some corrosive like arsenic, spearwort, or ratsbane.
[49]Harman, *A Caveat for Common Cursitors,* "A Drunken Tinker."
[50]Overbury, *op. cit.,* "Tinker."
[51]John Awdeley, *The Fraternity of Vagabonds,* London, 1561.
[52]Overbury, *op. cit.,* "Tinker."
[53]Good wine or ale.

[54]Harman, *op. cit.*, "A Drunken Tinker."
[56]Overbury, *op. cit.*, "Tinker."
[56]Markall, *op. cit.*, "Tinkers."
[57]Wibley, "Rogues and Vagabonds," in *Shakespeare's England*, Oxford, 1917, II, 484.
[58]*Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 1-30, *et passim.*
[59]Chandler, *The Literature of Roguery*, Cambridge, 1907, II, 53.
[60]Dekker? *O Per Se O*, London, 1612, 368, *et seq.*
[61]*Iibd.*, 380.
[62]*Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 121, *et seq.*
[63]Dekker? *op. cit.*, "Articles of their Fraternities," 377.
[64]Markall, *op. cit.*, 415.
[65]Aydelotte, *op. cit.*, 96.
[66]Dekker? *op. cit.*, 368.
[67]*Ibid.*, 368 *et seq.*
[68]*Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 33.
[69]*Ibid.*, IV, iv, 687-8.
[70]*Ibid.*, IV, iii, 60.
[71]*Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 82, Harman, *op. cit.*, "Rogue."
[72]*Winter's Tale, IV*, iv, 802. Cf. R. Green, *Black Book's Messenger*, London, 1592, in Judges, *Elizabethan Underworld*, 255. Chandler, *op. cit.*, I, 122-3.
[73]*Winter's Tale*, IV, iv, 240.
[74]*Ibid.*, IV, iv, 216-17.
[75]*Ibid.*, IV, iv, 250, *et seq.*
[76]Rollins, *The Pack of Autolycus*, Cambridge, 1927.
[77]*Ibid.*, Title Page.
[78]*Ibid.*, x-xi.
[79]*Winter's Tale*, IV, iv, 691.
[80]*Ibid.*, IV, iv, 691.
[81]*Ibid.*, IV, iv, 694-5.
[82]Aydelotte, *op. cit.*, I, 44.
[83]Steevens, in *Winter's Tale*, 220. Cf. *Winter's Tale*, V, ii, 27.
[84]Aydelotte, *op. cit.*, I, 44-45.
[85]T. Middleton, *The Last Will and Testament of Laurence Lucifer*, London, 1604, in Judges, *op. cit.*, 300.
[86]Wibley, *op. cit.*, II, 500.
[87]*Ibid.*, II, 500.
[88]*Ibid.*, II, 499.
[89]Firth, "Ballads and Broadsides," *Shakespeare's England*, Oxford, 1917, II, 54.
[90]Clark, *Shakespeare Characters*, London, 1863, 360.
[91]Aydelotte, *op. cit.*, I, 32-33.
[92]Judges, *op. cit.*, xvii.
[93]Davis, *Life in Elizabethan Days*, New York, 1920, 190.
[94]Markall, *op. cit.*, "Tinker."
[96]H. Bulthaupt, *op. cit.*, 378.
[97]Firth, *op. cit.*, 514.
[98]Aydelotte, *op. cit.*, I, 113.
[99]Schlegel, *op. cit.*, 181.
[100]J. W. Draper, "Orlando, The Younger Brother," *P. Q., XIII*, p. 72, et. seq.
[101]J. W. Draper, "Olivia's Household," *P. M. L. A.*, XLIX, 797, *et seq.*
[102]Louise D. Frasure, *op. cit.*, CRD, *et seq.*
[103]Aydelotte, *op. cit.*, I, 58.
[104]J. W. Draper, "Sir John Falstaff," *R. E. S.*
[105]*Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 111.
[106]*Henry IV*, V, iv, 119.
[107]Aydelotte, *op. cit.*, I, 32.
[108]Hazlitt, *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, London, 1869, 133.
[110]Furnivall, *op. cit.*, 372.
[111]*Winter's Tale*, V, ii, 113, *et passim.*
[112]R. Brome, *The Sporagus Garden*, London, 1635.
[113]Beaumont and Fletcher, *Beggars Bush*, London, C1515, II, i, 1.
[114]*Ibid.*, II, i, 221.
[115]Stokes, *A Dictionary of Characters and Proper Names in the Works of Shakespeare*, New York, 1924, s. v.
[116]*Winter's Tale*, IV, iv, 678.
[117]Gatch, "Shakespeare's Allusions to the Older Drama," *P. Q.*, VIII, 27, *et seq.*

SHYLOCK AND PORTIA

By JOHN E. HANNIGAN

SHYLOCK is a character in English literature who does not die. For three hundred and fifty years, people have been thinking of and debating him. I am trying not to hold a brief for or against him, but I hope to analyze an objective record. The record is the play, *The Merchant of Venice.*

Out of seventeen scenes, he appears in only four. No one who has seen him on the stage or read of him on the printed page forgets him. His name has passed into the vernacular, with a sinister connotation.

Is it a just connotation? The best-known commentators on the great Shaksperian characters have not given him the attention they have given Hamlet, Lear, Macbeth, Othello. There are those who believe that Shylock was intended to stand by the side of those tragic heroes. They think he is like them in being a dominating central figure; like them of lofty character; like them crushed by a weakness, a flaw in character, a psychosis which became a nemesis.

Hamlet was prince, scholar, philosopher; Lear, ex-king, regal, generous, a bit senile; Macbeth, chieftain, brave, ambitious; Othello, warrior, condottiere of Venice's army, high-minded Negro husband of high-minded white woman. As Hamlet himself said, "these men, carrying the stamp of one defect, their virtues else, be they pure as grace, as infinite as man may undergo, shall in the general censure take corruption from that particular fault." In Hamlet it was vacillation, in Lear vanity, in Macbeth superstition, in Othello gullibility, perhaps also miscegenation. A besetting weakness brought them down at the last, helpless and broken.

In the beginning they are held in public honor and loved. Not so Shylock. Shylock from the beginning is the target of hate. He is the austere resident of a pleasure-loving city, a contemptuous money-lender in a community

that lives high and beyond its means, a bearded alien in an outlandish garb from the foot of Sinai, carrying the code of Moses to the Rialto of Venice. The religion, the laws and traditions of his race are alone sacred to him, his Jewish birth a supreme honor; he fears only the God of Abraham, and admires only the business acumen of Jacob. His powerful tongue can be suave or bitter. His speech echoes the poetry, not the songs of Solomon, but the Proverbs of Solomon. One tender sentiment he cherishes, the memory of his dead wife, Leah, the mother of his only child. In the common speech his name means avarice. But the common acceptance is wrong according to the record, or perhaps according to our reading of it.

Shylock's obsession was revenge—revenge for habitual wanton insult to his feelings, revenge for that badge of physical and spiritual suffering and outrage which in every land, for untold centuries, his exiled tribe had been condemned and forced to wear.

If ever a race is justified in a desire for revenge, it is the Jewish race. If ever a persecuted race has shown little or no disposition toward revenge, it is the Jewish race. Only dominant races who persecute may hope to cherish revenges. In his mania for revenge, Shylock took a leaf from the dominant persecuting Gentile whom he despised. This was the stamp of his defect.

Said Salarino: "Why, I am sure, if he forfeit, thou wilt not take his flesh; what's that good for?" Shylock's reply is one of the most trenchant, eloquent passages in English. It also supplies the clue to his tragedy:

> "To bait fish withal. If it will feed nothing else it will feed my revenge. He hath disgraced me and hindered me half a million, laughed at my losses, mocked at my gains, scorned my nation, thwarted my bargains, cooled my friends, heated mine enemies, and what's his reason?
>
> I am a Jew. Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die? And if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If we are like you in

> the rest, we will resemble you in that. If a Jew wrong a Christian, what is his humility? Revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by Christian example? Why, revenge! The villainy you teach me I will execute,—and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction.

And later he concluded his reply to the Duke, who in a friendly and reasonable tone urged him to show a little pity for the bankrupt merchant:

> "So I can give no reason, nor I will not,
> More than a lodg'd hate and a certain loathing
> I bear Antonio, that I follow thus
> A losing suit against him. Are you answer'd?"

"For thy three thousand ducats here is six," says Bassanio in the court, and Shylock replies:

> "If every ducat in six thousand ducats
> Were in six parts, and every part a ducat,
> I would not draw them; I would have my bond."

Thirty-six thousand ducats or pounds sterling or dollars seems a high price for sixteen ounces of revenge, unless you look upon revenge as the essential thing. But he kept his hate within the law, as he believed. No wilful law-breaker is he. "I stand here for law. What judgment shall I dread, doing no wrong?"

Avarice was not a Shylock characteristic. Let us hope that appreciation of the importance of money is not avarice. When a smart race or class is outlawed and its members denied citizenship and land, they will find the way to money. Shakspere, greatest of poets, was the wealthiest of poets; a purveyor of drama, an actor and theatre owner, he dabbled in money-lending. He peopled his stage with three-dimensional characters reacting to the emotions, yielding to the motives and uttering the speech of eternal human interest, for the entertainment of people of all classes and races who crowded his theatres in London and Southwark. The persons of his drama outlive the ages. They speak the language and live the life of basic human nature, which in part is divine, whispering their quizzical asides to the sagacious and the judicious who understand. How far may we, inheritors of Shaksperian plays, penetrate the veil of magical song, poetry, wit, humor, irony, philosophy, eloquence that is Shakspere, to the latent truth and justice that is Shakspere?

Those who see in this play only an unforgettable comedy of grace and beauty, the triumph of virtue and love and the frustration of villainy, are free to do so. From the mouth of pretentious Bassanio, however, come arresting words:

> "So may the outward shows be least themselves;
> The world is still deceiv'd with ornament.
> In law what plea so tainted and corrupt
> But, season'd with a gracious voice,
> Obscures the show of evil?"

Shylock's voice is not gracious. He makes no tainted or corrupt plea. His outward show is his inmost self, good and bad. Antonio has stung him afresh, in the very transaction that is the cause of the litigation. "Shylock," said he, in effect, "lend your money to me as I am your enemy. I shall spurn you and spit on you just the same. If I don't pay you, you can exact the penalty. Do your worst. I'll sign the bond, but I trust my ships to pay you on time. I shan't trust you not to demand the flesh." Reckless talk, this, from him who in the clutch can borrow money from no friend in the rich city of Venice, from no one but Shylock, his bosom enemy. Shylock deceives no one by ornament, or falsehood, or pretence. He is the forthright man, fearless and high-headed in his cold Jewish rectitude, a hard man, who seeks no favors. "Let not the sound of shallow foppery enter my sober house," says he, in scorn of his Gentile neighbors.

The character of Shylock was written, probably, as were Hamlet, Macbeth, Lear, Othello, and probably Brutus, for Shakspere's friend, Richard Burbage, the star player of the Lord Chamberlain's company. Shakspere is a disinterested umpire. He plays no favorites.

What a counterfoil is that other character, Portia! Portia, the gracious, the witty and wealthy heiress, the charming, high-spirited social registerite, the glamor lady *par excellence* of the Shaksperian galaxy of high-born women,—perhaps the most fascinating debutante in literature,—the gentle Christian contrast to Shylock, the harsh and inexorable Jew.

I would not fling a word against her ladyship. Yet, says

Will Shakspere, from whose brain and heart she sprang full panoplied in a glow of color and beauty,

"So may the outward shows be least themselves."

She had loaded the dice in violation of her father's will, so that the witless spendthrift Bassanio would make no mistake, the glib-tongued Bassanio wearing the finery and bearing the gifts that Shylock's three thousand ducats had paid for. "A day in April never came so sweet." Her father would have been shocked. After the lucky draw of the casket, the fellow tells her about his uncle Antonio's plight and the cause of it, admits that he is a braggart, and says that it is imperative that he go at once to Venice for the trial. After secretly marrying him, pretending to go to a monastery for a season of prayer until he comes back, she posts down (or up) to Venice as Balthasar, the young doctor of laws from Rome, recommended by Bellario (the distinguished juris-consult of Padua). She had probably never seen the title-page of a law book, but Law Professor Bellario was her uncle and disposed to give expert though hasty instructions to his intelligent young niece, as well as a false letter of recommendation. So into the court she comes, an accomplished scholar and jurist. As we all know, but most of us overlook the point, she is as deeply concerned about the case as her husband is. That is why she comes as judge. She is the least impartial judge in the annals of jurisprudence. She has a clear conception of one aspect of the case—she knows how it is going to be decided. The defendant is her own kinsman by marriage, but Shylock does not know this. The three thousand ducats which Antonio promised to repay but didn't repay had been used for a false show to influence her judgment in marriage, as she well knows now. The six thousand ducats tendered by her husband in the open court to discharge the defendant's bond is her money. Her maid Nerissa, posing as a law clerk, is the wife of Gratiano, the fellow who talks all day but never says anything; he was the best man at the wedding of the judge. He is keeping up his chatter in the court. At her palatial home at Belmont, concealed or displayed, is the loot—or what is left of it, stolen from the plaintiff Shylock's house that night he was lured out to dine with Bassanio, and during the judicial absence of the lovely

hostess the menage at Belmont is in charge of two house guests, dear friends now of the family: Lorenzo, accessory before and after the fact if not principal in a crime, and faithless Jessica, who robbed her own father even of the turquoise ring her dead mother had given him, the ring she swapped for a monkey at a sailors' night club at Genoa, where she stopped for an eighty-ducat dinner on her way to Belmont. The monkey presumably is in the Monkey House at Belmont, waiting to furnish amusement for the hostess when she returns from her judicial adventure in Venice.

We impeach judges for affiliations with dubious characters. We do not revere judges who conceal their close relationship with the parties in whose favor they decide. Perhaps her ignorance of the law left Lady Bassanio oblivious to her legal situation as a harborer and receiver. If Bellario, her adviser, had been fully informed of the facts, he might have warned her, but perhaps not.

What a gracious voice is hers, as, knowing he is an alien, she leads Shylock on to refuse the money by assuring him that he has an excellent case in law, then making that beautiful but tainted plea for mercy. And when he refuses to fall for her high-sounding eloquence, note the change of tone and the sophistry with which she lays it down that although he has a good case yet his refusal of the money and demand for a lawful judgment of his lawful case makes him a criminal because this lawful judgment on a lawful case if granted to an alien might possibly be fatal to the defendant, a citizen (it certainly wouldn't do the citizen any good, no matter who was plaintiff), and therefore by law this plaintiff has forfeited his property and his life. Shylock had said, "I'm pursuing the revenge the Christians taught me, but I'm relying on the Venetian law of merchants."

How now, Shylock? You have just listened to a moving homily on mercy. You refused to grant mercy to your enemy. Is there any mercy for you? Oh, yes. After you are stripped of your property and your religion by the law which you thought would protect you, you may be merci-

fully suffered to live; but you must turn half of your property over to the fellow who defaulted his bond; he is an ocean carrier, now bankrupt, pursued by a horde of international creditors, who are seeking him out as the suitors from all lands sought Portia, but for a different purpose. They purpose to put him in jail, or maybe sell him into slavery. He will be a good trustee to administer your high-grade bonds and securities and the notes of Gentiles who borrowed money from you,—for the benefit of your fine daughter and your new son-in-law. The other half you will deed directly to the precious pair, reserving a life interest for yourself, and then you will abjure your Jewish religion and become a Christian. You may as well do all these things voluntarily, for if you don't we merciful Christians will take your property anyhow and your life as well.

And Gobbo, the wise fool, who is Shakspere himself, wisecracks, "We were Christians enow before; e'en as many as could well live, one by another. This making of Christians will raise the price of hogs; if we grow all to be pork-eaters, we shall not shortly have a rasher on the coals for money."

Having made Antonio a trustee, Shakspere must now bring the wrecked fleet home to port.

And so passed Shylock into the Shaksperian Hall of Fame, not for an age, but for all time. Shylock, your sin was revenge against an enemy who hated you. It was the most rational of all the sins of Shakspere's heroes. It approached a kind of justice, but you were the victim of it at the last. Some folks sympathize with you, others think you carried it too far. You remain a powerful human character, with all your faults.

Boston, Mass.

THE LITERARY ORIGINS OF ROBERT GREENE

By THOMAS H. MCNEAL

THE literary origins of Robert Greene have been extensively worked out; but information regarding them is scattered and sometimes difficult to get at. The main works on Greene are often not full enough on the subject, and have omitted a number of what seem to be authentic facts. Likewise, they have left out suggestions as to sources which, though minor, may be of considerable importance, and which at least need investigation.

The following summary attempts to offer in a few pages a fairly inclusive gathering together of Greene's dependencies. No promise is made that it is complete, but it is certainly much fuller than is any other work to which one may turn for this information.

In general—though such a division fails to cover certain particular cases—the great influences which have so far been uncovered are four: (1) Lyly's *Euphues* and Sidney's *Arcadia;* (2) Boccaccio; (3) the Greek romances; and (4) Marlowe.

Lyly's *Euphues,* which was published in 1578 and 1579, exercised the first and, in some respects, a lasting influence upon Greene. *Mamillia,* Greene's first recorded work, was licensed on October 3, 1580,[1] when Greene was only twenty-two years old. Considering the youth of the author and the interesting, if badly managed, story that is told, we may call the piece an inspired rather than a flagrant imitation of the older piece. Storojenko finds him copying the model only in mannerisms and modes of treatment;[2] but Jordan points out so many reversed or perverted likenesses that it is safe to conclude that Greene hewed close to the line laid down by Lyly.[3] "Thenceforth the Euphuistic strain ran through all his books with greater or less strength, till he excluded it abruptly and consciously from his *Conny Catching* series and from *The Black Bookes Messenger.*"[4] At least two other of his works should be placed with *Mamillia* as revealing, likewise, a kinship to *Euphues* in more than

mere style,—*A Mirrour of Modestie,* printed in 1584, and *Euphues His Censure to Philautus,* licensed September 18, 1587. In the first, according to Storojenko, the wish to imitate Lyly approaches the ridiculous. "In none of his works does Greene show himself so slavish an imitator of Lyly's as in this, and, we may add, nowhere does he prove himself so bad a story-teller."[5] In the last, there is a close "connection to Lylly's celebrated story."[6] Greene's *Euphues His Censure to Philautus,* in fact, purports to be a sort of sequel to *Euphues,* as may be understood from the title.

The popularity of Sidney's *Arcadia,* printed in 1590, after having circulated in manuscript for some time,[7] turned Greene's attention to the new pastoral movement. He produced two imitations of Sidney's work,—*Menaphon,* licensed in 1589, and *Philomela,* licensed in 1592 but "written long since and kept charily."[8] The first of these drew from Sidney various elements, particularly the wooing of Sephestia by both father and son.[9] *Philomela,* though not such an imitation as *Menaphon,* is nevertheless considerably dependent upon the *Arcadia.*

From Boccaccio's *Decameron,* Ninth Tale, Second Day, Greene appears to have borrowed the fundamental idea of *Philomela,*[10] and Dr. Wolff notes that the device of the self-accusation by husband and wife, each desiring to save the other, appears in the Eighth Tale, Tenth Day, of the Italian work.[11] For the concluding episode of the novel, Greene probably turned to Boccaccio's *Titus and Giuseppa.*[12] The first tale in *Perymedes the Blacksmith* is a paraphrase of the *Decameron,* Sixth Tale, Second Day;[13] and the second story in Greene's novel is an obvious translation of the *Decameron,* Second Tale, Fifth Day.[14] Storojenko adds to this list of Greene's leanings toward Boccaccio's great work "several loose anecdotes of Catholic monks in his political pamphlet, *The Spanish Masquerado.*"[15] It has also been noted that the story of Valdracko in the *Planetomachia* is, in one *motif* at least, very close to the *Decameron,* Third Tale, Third Day.

Expounder of the influences of the Greek romances upon Greene's prose tales is Dr. S. L. Wolff. In his careful work, *The Greek Romances and Elizabethan Prose Fic-*

tion (1912), he devotes a chapter to Greene and his Greek romance origins. The speculations and assignments offered are both interesting and necessary in an intelligent approach to Greene; and, in general, Greene's connection with the suggested sources is adequately established. In particular cases, however, the conclusions reached are not so fortunate. The reader constantly wonders if Greene might not have obtained a plot or device that he uses from some other and more likely source than the one pointed out.[16] An outline of Dr. Wolff's notations follows:[17]

1. From the *Clitophon and Leucippe* of Achilles Tatius, Greene borrowed materials for *Arbasto, The Carde of Fancie, Alcida, Never too Late, Morando, Pandosto, Philomela,* and *A Groatsworth of Wit.*

2. From the *AEthiopica* of Heliodorus: *Mamillia, Pandosto, Menaphon, Alcida, The Carde of Fancie, Planetomachia, Perymedes the Blacksmith, Tullies Loue,* and *Philomela.*

3. From the *Daphnis and Chloe* of Longus: *Menaphon* and *Pandosto.*[18]

The influence of Marlowe is readily discernible in *Greene's* plays. Jordan states that the relation between *Alphonsus* and Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* is that of copy and model,[19] and Storojenko gives an excellent summary of Greene's indebtedness to the older play.[20] The inspiration of *Frier Bacon and Frier Bongay* is, according to Dickinson, Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus;*[21] though *Frier Bacon* appears to be based on the narrative of *The Famous History of Frier Bacon* and perhaps on a German romance, the story of *Dr. Faustus* (1587).[22] *Orlando Furioso,* though evolved out of a free use of Ariosto's poem of the same name,[23] is nevertheless allied to *Tamburlaine,* and may be to some extent a satire on that play.[24] Professor R. A. Law finds in the *Looking Glass for London* two borrowings from *Dr. Faustus.*[25] The impression that Marlowe made upon Greene is thus seen to have been strong, though there is little or no direct plagiarism.

Other and miscellaneous influences upon the author's

works do not fall into the groups suggested, and need, therefore, to be summarized separately: Storojenko says that in the *Carde of Fancie* Greene "was indebted to the Italian novelists,"[26] and Wolff finds certain incidents in the work that recall *Huon of Bordeaux*.[27] The tale of Mulcasses, King of Thunis, in the *Farewell to Follie,* finds a part source in Paulus Jovius's *Elogia virorum bellica virtute illustrium;*[28] and the *Farewell to Follie,* as well as *Penelopes Web* and *Morando,* the *Tritameron of Loue,* are made up of discourses extracted largerly, as H. C. Hart has noted, from Primaudaye's *Academy*.[29] This source was translated into English by Thomas Bowes in 1586 as *Platonical Academy & Schoole of Moral Philosophy,* and it is this translation that Greene followed.[30] In fact, after 1586 other of "Greene's writings show large verbal borrowings from Primaudaye."[31] *The Royal Exchange* is "a collection of moral aphorisms, translated from the Italian,"[32] its source being *La Burza Reale,* by an unknown author.[33] *Planetomachia* contains a "Theme similar to that of Lyly's *Woman in the Moon,*"[34] and a preface, according to Wolff, taken over nearly entirely from Pantano's dialogue called Aegidius.[35] Dr. Wolff also finds that the tale of Valdracko in the *Planetomachia* is in some respects similar to Cinthio's tragedy of *Orbecche,* or his narrative version of the same story in the *Hecatomithi,* II, ii,[36] Dickinson notes that one of the tales in the work is derived from Aelian.[37] P. A. Daniel was the first to point out that much of the plot of *James IV* appears in the *Hecatomithi,* III, i.[38] *Pandosto,* which has already been listed under the Greek romances, has been given by Caro a source in a legend chronicled by the Archbishop of Gnese, Tcharakoffsky,[39] and the piece furthermore shows some relationship to Lyly's *Campaspe*.[40] *A Quippe for an Upstart Courtier* is an inspired paraphrase of an anonymous poem, the *Debate between Pride and Lowliness*.[41] From the Bible comes the Prodigal Son *motif* found in the first tale of the *Mourning Garment,*[42] as does the story of Jonah in the *Looking-Glasse for London.* Greene's works are, in fact, heavy with Biblical allusions. Twice material is gathered for a tale from the Apocryphal book of Susanna,—in the *Myrrour of Modestie* and in *Francescos Fortunes*.[43] Wolff places *Arbasto* under the influence of *Huon of Bordeaux*.[44] Menaphon, which

has been presented as an imitation of the *Arcadia* and as having borrowed from *Daphnis and Chloe,* is thought to have received its central idea from Warner's tale of Argentile and Curan in *Albion's England.*[45] A tale in the *Disputation between a Hee and a Shee Conny-Catcher,* the story of "a pleasant discourse, how a wife . . . becomes a modest matron," is from Gascoigne's *The Adventures of Master F. J.*[46] Greene patterns *Euphues His Censure to Philautus* after *Il Cortegiano* by Castiglione,[47] and Orpheus's story of Lida in the *Orpharion* is from Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso,* XXXIV, 7-43.[48] For what I believe to be rather extensive further borrowings on Greene's part, see my own work, *The Influence of Chaucer on the Works of Robert Greene.*[49]

This review of labors done in Greene's literary origins reveals that of the twenty-three prose pieces containing fiction, all have been investigated and assigned—sometimes with justification, sometimes by what looks like a stretch of the imagination—to one or more sources. All five of the known plays have been traced to definite beginnings.

East Texas State Teachers College
Commerce, Texas

---

[1]The dates of Greene's works that I use are from J. C. Jordan's *Robert Greene,* 1915.

[2]Storojenko, Nicholas, *The Life of Robert Greene,* 1878. Translated from the Russian by E. Z. B. Hodgetts, in A. B. Grosart's edition of *The Complete Works of Robert Greene,* Introduction, I, 70.

[3]*Robert Greene,* p. 14ff.

[4]Wolff, S. M., *The Greek Romances and Elizabethan Prose Fiction,* 1912, p. 367.

[5]Grosart, *op. cit.,* XI, 109.

[6]*Ibid.,* p. 84.

[7]Wolff, *The Greek Romances,* p. 368.

[8]Grosart, I, 71.

[9]Jordan, p. 41.

[10]Storojenko, in Grosart, I, 157.

[11]"Robert Greene and the Italian Renaissance," *Englische Studien,* 1906, XXXVII, p. 346, n. 1.

[12]Storojenko, in Grosart, I, 157.

[13]*Ibid.*

[14]Wolff, *The Greek Romances,* p. 370.

[15]Storojenko, in Grosart, I, 158.

[16]Mr. Joseph de Perott has revealed clearly, it seems, that once at least Greene's borrowing is not from the original Greek, but from an Italian translation. See his "Robert Greene and the Italian Translation of Achilles Tatius," *MLN,* XXIX, p. 63, 1914.

[17]For analyses of Greene's various relationships to the suggested sources, see the *Greek Romances,* Part II, Chapter III.

[18]*Daphnis and Chloe* was translated into English by Angel Day in 1587, and it is this translation that Greene used. See *Greek Romances,* p. 447. Since Dr. Wolff admits that Greene used a translation here, and since Mr. de Perott has found him using an Italian translation of Achilles Tatius, it appears that Greene's ability to read Greek works in the original may have had its limitations. One wonders if he did not likewise avail himself of a translation of Heliodorus.

[19]*Greek Romances,* p. 175.

[20]Grosart, I, 175.

[21]Dickinson, Thomas H., *The Complete Plays of Robert Greene,* 1909. Introduction, p. xxxvii. Dickinson "agrees with Collins that 'the presumption in favor of Faustus having preceded Greene's play is overwhelmingly strong.' "

[22]*Ibid.*

[23]*Ibid.* Preface to "Friar Bacon," p. 224. C. W. Lemmi refutes this stand in *"Tamburlaine* and Greene's *Orlando Furioso," MLN,* 1917, XXXII, 434-5; as does M. R. Morrison in "Greene's Use of Ariosto in *Orlando Furioso," MLN,* 1934, XLIX, 449-51.

[24]*Ibid.* See also C. M. Gayley's *Representative English Comedies,* 1930, I, 410.

[25]"Two Parallels to Greene and Lodge's *Looking Glass," MLN,* XXVI, 146-8, 1911.

[26]Grosart, I, 71.

[27]*Greek Romances,* p. 368, n. 4.

[28]Wolff, "Robert Greene and the Italian Renaissance," p. 326.

[29]Jordan, p. 22, n. 16; p. 23, n. 19; and p. 25, n. 22.

[30]Jordan, p. 22, n. 16.

[31]*Ibid.*

[32]Storojenko, in Grosart, I, 118.

[33]Jordan, p. 169.

[34]*Ibid.,* p. 26.

[35]"Robert Greene and the Italian Renaissance," p. 333, n. 1.

[36]*Ibid.,* p. 346, n. 1.

[37]Dickinson, Introduction, p. xvi.

[38]Grosart, Editor's Introduction, I, xli.

[39]J. Caro, "Die Historischen Elemente in Shakespeares Sturm und Wintermärchen," *Englische Studien,* 1879, II, 141.

[40]Dickinson, Introduction, p. xxx. Also, for another suggestion, see my *"The Clerk's* Tale as a Possible Source for *Pandosto," PMLA,* 1932, XLVII, 453.

[41]Jordan, p. 122.

[42]Storojenko, in Grosart, I, 122.

[43]*The Greek Romances,* p. 269.

[44]*Ibid.,* p. 368.

[45]J. Q. Adams, "Greene's 'Menaphon' and 'The Thracian Wonder.' " *Mod. Phil.,* 1905, III, 317-18.

[46]J. C. Jordan, "Greene and Gascoigne," *MLN,* 1915, XXX, 61-2.

[47]"Robert Greene and the Italian Renaissance," p. 326.

[48]*Ibid.,* p. 346, n. 1. Dr. Wolff throughout his study gives numerous allusions in Greene's works to various Italian authors. These, however interesting, I have omitted in my summary as of minor importance.

[49]University of Texas Doctor's Dissertation, 1937.

SHAKSPERE AND THE DOCTRINE OF COSMIC IDENTITIES[1]

By DON CAMERON ALLEN

THE theory of cosmic identities is difficult to discuss because it is so closely related to many different branches of philosophic thought. It is an adjunct of numerous theses of neo-platonic provenance; it is allied to the physical concepts of elemental composition; and it is a basic theorem of the doctrine of the humours and the complexions. Through these relationships it becomes one of the pedestals of Renaissance psychology, medicine, physics, and, as Leube[2] and Cassirer[3] have shown, theology and politics. The legitimate departments of knowledge did not share it alone, for the arts of alchemy, astrology, hydromancy and geomancy claimed it as well.

The postulates are very simple. It is assumed that all things are composed of various and determining proportions of the four elements; hence there is a sympathetic or antipathetic relationship between all things and a hierarchy of created matter. This postulate produces certain maxims. It is assumed that a disturbance in the macrocosm will produce a disturbance in the microcosm, that the microcosm contains all the forms of the macrocosm, and that the essential nature of matter is determined by the proportions of the compounding elements. A man in whom earth predominates will have a nature like that of the lower forms of life, whereas one in whom fire predominates will be akin to the celestial beings.

The theory is very old. It is adumbrated in Plato and Aristotle. It became part of the Alexandrian systems and so passed into the Middle Ages. During the Renaissance it was given new emphasis by the members of the Florentine Academy.[4] One would not be so imprudent as to suggest that Shakspere had his incentive from the proteges of Lorenzo il Vecchio, but, without question, many minor philosophers of the sixteenth century were influenced by the notions of fifteenth century Florence.

If one looks over the writings of men like Vespuccio,[5]

Agrippa,,[6] Doni,[7] Cardano,[8] De Tyard,[9] Goclenius,[10] Du Pleix,[11] Bouaisteau,[12] De la Primaudaye,[13], Quercetanus,[14] Alsted,[15] Woolton,[16] Dove,[17] and Purchas,[18] one finds frequent reference to the theory of cosmic identities. Doni, for example, likens the head of man to the skies, the eyes to the sun and moon, the veins and arteries to rivers, the liver to the sea, the digestion to the tides, the breath to the winds, the bones to stones, the hair to vegetation, the sweat and tears to dews and fountains, and the fevers to earthquakes. Cardano lists the various forms of life in man; he finds that man contains the boar, lynx, rabbit, elephant, hyaena, serpent, rhinoceros, chameleon, stag, fish, whale, crocodile, and salamander.[19] All of these writers comment on the relationship between the two worlds and most of them touch on the hierarchy of matter. De Tyard furnishes an illustration when he states that the senses of man are of the earth, whereas the reason is of air and fire; hence when man thinks, he is at one with the stars. He likens the head of man to the sky because it contains reason in which the highest elements predominate. In a manner not unlike Anatol France's M. d'Astarac, De Tyard urges his readers to cultivate the element of fire by surrendering to reason.

Besides the writers mentioned, another exponent of these notions is to be found in the half-shadowy person of Paracelsus. Because of the quarrel between the disciples of Galen and Paracelsus, men of the Renaissance were *au courant* with the doctrines of the latter school. Shakspere refers to this quarrel in *All's Well* (II, iii, 11), and one finds references to this unsavoury physician in the writings of many of Shakspere's fellows.[20] One cannot doubt that both the man and his notions were known to literate men of the age.

The basic ideas of Paracelsus were like those already cited.[21] All the objects in the macrocosm are to be found in the microcosm. Man, says Paracelsus, contains a thousand trees, plants, animals, metals, and minerals. To the amusement of Bruno,[22] he divided man into a map of the world and may have begot Shakspere's "map of my microcosm" (*Cor.* II, i, 61) and the geographical description of Dromio of Syracuse's sweetheart. The difference between Paracelsus and the lesser philosophers is that Paracelsus applied the theory of cosmic identities to medicine. Fevers

are like earthquakes, the colic like a windstorm, sweating-sickness like a cloud-burst, and dropsy like a flood. If one knew what produced these distempers in the macrocosm, one could heal the parallel diseases of the microcosm.

All these notions were popular with the literary men of Shakspere's age. As Miss Campbell observes, *microcosmos* became a sort of set title.[23] One thinks of Davies, Smith, Fletcher and Earle, but the figments of the theory appear everywhere.[24] One of the best evidences of the popularity of the theory is that both Bacon[25] and Bruno, the two most formidable philosophers of the day, were definitely opposed to the theory of Paracelsus. How many of these tenets did Shakspere know and how did he employ them in his writings?

The word *microcosm* is mentioned but once in the Shaksperian corpus, but references to the "little world" or to man as a "world" are more frequent. Richard II would breed a generation of thoughts to people "this little world in humours like the people of this world" (V, v, 8-10); Imogen having lost her title, but having found her brothers, has "got two worlds by 't" (V, v, 374); Lear is reported as striving "in his little world of man" (III, i, 10).[26] The terminology and definitions are obviously known to Shakspere; he also accepts the theory of the elements and their attending influences.

Antony informs us that the elements were evenly balanced in Brutus (V, v, 73-75); Cleopatra, embracing death and the spiritual form, is air and fire (V, ii, 286-289); Caliban is earth (I, ii, 314) and filth (I, ii, 346); and Timon, pondering the final dissolution perceptible in old men, observes that "nature, as it grows again toward earth, is fashioned for the journey, dull and heavy" (II, ii, 220-223). Uncle Toby sums it up in a line: "Does not our life consist of the four elements" (II, iii, 9-10). The doctrine of influences is also present. Friar Laurence expatiates upon them in poetic diction (II, iii, 1520) that is echoed in *Pericles* (III, ii, 31-38). The emblem of the sun and the marigold, which Ficino had not scorned to use, is found in the *Winter's Tale* (IV, iv, 105-106). Like most men

of his time, Shakspere was aware of the influence of the greater world on the lesser.[27]

Shakspere also employed these notions in his poetic imagery. One finds him following the idea that the head was the sky and the eyes the sun and moon. Images of this type appear in *II Hen.* VI (IV, iv, 15-16), *Love's Labours Lost* (V, ii, 203-206), *Errors* (III, ii, 55-56), and *Hamlet* (II, i, 10); the best example occurs in *Antony and Cleopatra* (V, ii, 79-81):

> "His face was as the heavens; and therein stuck
> A sun and moon, which kept their course, and lighted
> The little O, the earth."

The idea is treated humorously in *I Henry IV* (II, iv, 351-356) where the hypothesis is used to explain Bardolph's canary face, and in *Errors* (IV, ii, 5-6) to explain facial reactions. Both ideas might have pleased Paracelsus, but the laughter would not.

In similar wise Shakspere regards the moist secretions of the body as rains and dews. Pandarus wishes for rain to lay the wind that threatens his heart (IV, iv, 53-54); Richard II will oppose his rain to Bolingbroke's fire (III, iii, 58-60); Gloucester announces that Lear "holp the heavens to rain" (III, vii, 65); and Romeo "augments the morning dew" with his tears (I, i, 137-139). Cleopatra's winds and rains, we are told, cannot be likened to sighs and tears because no almanac records such tempests (I, ii, 143-148).[28] Comparisons of the waterways of the earth to the conduits of the body also appear. Menenius speaks of the veins as "rivers" (*Cor.,* I, i, 133-134) and Agamemnon complains of Ajax's "pettish lunes, his ebbs, his flows" (II, iii, 136-139). The fever-colic-earthquake comparison appears in a speech of Hotspur (III, i, 28-31) and in Lennox's report of the macrocosmic disturbance attendant on the murder of Duncan (II, iii, 62).

Shakspere saw also the lower forms of life in man. One of the sonnets (XV) links the growth of men to that of plants. Lear's elder daughters are regularly compared to animals, birds and reptiles. Ajax has "robbed many beasts of their particular additions" in that he is valiant as a lion,

churlish as a bear, and slow as an elephant (I, i, 19-24). In *Pericles* (II, i, 30-37) men are likened to fish, and one recalls also the animal epithets in *Othello* (III, iii, 403-406). These are some examples of Shakspere's use of the conventional macrocosmic-microcosmic comparisons in his imagery; he did not, however, limit himself to the bare externalia of the hypothesis.

One remembers that Shakspere is not loath to suggest a macrocosmic disturbance prior to some disaster in the world of man. In *Julius Caesar* and *Richard II,* the macrocosm's upheaval foreshadows the fall of Richard and the death of Caesar. "But let the frame of things disjoint," says Macbeth, "both the worlds suffer." (III, ii, 16-19). These lines suggest something more. To the old thesis Shakspere added a new twist when he decided that a disturbance in the microcosm could produce a catastrophe in the macrocosm. In this way he makes man morally responsible for the harmony of the universe. Othello, having slain his wife, is appalled that nature should be calm (V, ii, 99-101). In *Lear* and *Macbeth* actual cataclysms threaten the macrocosm when the accord in the microcosm has been fractured. The tempest subsequent to the murder of Duncan and the conduct of the horses is a direct result of Macbeth's crime. The same theorem governs the play of *Lear.* Throughout the woeful third act, Lear struggles with the tempest without and the tempest within and recognizes their identity (III, iv, 11-14):

> "When the mind's free
> The body's delicate; the tempest in my mind
> Doth from my senses take all feeling else
> Save what beats there."

In the end, Lear, aware of his microcosmic nature, offers his mortal hand to Gloucester, who takes up the theme:

> "O ruin'd piece of nature! This great world
> Shall so wear out to naught." (IV vi, 138-139).

The doctrine of the moral relationship between the two worlds threads its way through the tangle of *Hamlet.* The Prince takes his mother to task in words that reecho the speech of Othello at his wife's bier:

> "Heavens face doth glow;
> Yea, this solidity and compound mass

> With trustful visage, as against the doom,
> Is thought-sick at the act." (III, iv, 48-51).

In *Hamlet* one also finds, as one can find it in other of the plays, the Shaksperian usage of the macrocosmic-microcosmic doctrine of the hierarchy of elements. One discovers in the texture of the dramatic thought a constant struggle between the lowest and the highest element, between earth and fire. One of *Hamlet's* most strangling obsessions is his conviction of the damning overweight of the lowest element and the lowest creatures in the microcosm. His personal sensitiveness to the crowding clay and his consciousness of the animal behaviour of his mother are indicated in the first soliloquy. The attitude is not dropped with the speech. He is amazed at the expedition of young Fortinbras in search of an addition of dirt (IV, iv, 17); he describes Osric as a man "spacious in the possession of dirt" (V, ii, 89-90); he compounds the body of Polonius with the dust "whereto 'tis kin" (IV, iii, 7). He considers his own flesh. If it could but melt, resolve itself to a dew; but unfortunately it sinks lower than water in the hierarchy of elements. This monomania is extended with terrible humor in the graveyard scenes which reek with the thought of the dissolution of man into the lowest of elements. But the howl of the beast, lower than man because it wants the control of reason, is also heard in man.

As in *Lear* and *Othello,* the animal epithet is repeated in *Hamlet.* The elder Hamlet calls his brother a beast (I, v, 42); the younger Hamlet laments the "swinish" habits of his nation and proceeds to consider how the forts of reason fall through the "o'ergrowth of some complexion" (I, iv, 19-36). He moulds this idea and repeats it in the latter part of the tragedy (IV, iv, 33-39):

> "What is a man
> If his chief good and market of his time
> Be but to sleep and feed? a beast, no more.
> Sure he that made us with such large discourse,
> Looking before and after, gave us not
> That capability and god-like reason
> To fust in us unused."

Reason, which the expounders of the theory of cosmic identities symbolized by fire, which, as De Tyard said, rested

in the heavens of man as God rested in the skies, is the power which Hamlet considered necessary to lift man above earth, the lowest of elements, and above the beasts in man. Even the adulterous and murderous King knows this, for, seeing the mad Ophelia, he says with pity:

> "Poor Ophelia
> Divided from herself and her fair judgement,
> Without which we are pictures, or mere beasts." (IV, v, 83-85).

This power of reason, of the pure fire in man, forces Hamlet to many sad conclusions, but none is more bitter than that which comes to utterance when he views poor fellows like himself "crawling between heaven and earth."

> "What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals! And yet to me what is this quintessence of dust?" (II, ii, 318-324).

Here is a summary that would have won the admiration of either Ficino or Pico; it is also, perhaps, one of the basic motifs at this time of Shakspere's attitude toward life. Man who shares with gods and angels in the highest elements is withal a quintessence of dust. It is this fourth and final element that mists his heart with Arctic cold.

Duke University.

---

[1]The material for this essay (presented in summary at the Fifty-Fifth Meeting of the Modern Language Association) was gathered while the author was a fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies. The problem has been treated before by Dr. Ruth Anderson, *Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays, University of Iowa Humanistic Studies,* III, 4 (1927), 61-68.

[2]Hans Leube,*Reformation und Humanismus in England* (Leipzig, 1930), pp. 12-26.

[3]Ernst Cassirer, *Individuum und Kosmos in der Philosophie der Renaissance, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg,* X (1927), pp. 92-97, 115-118.

[4]G. P. Conger, *Theories of Macrocosm and Microcosm in the History of Philosophy,* New York, 1922. See also the index to the four volumes of L. Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science.*

[5]"Oratio," *Sphaera Tractatus* (Venetia, 1531), sig. A7r.

[6]*Three Books of Occult Philosophy* (W. F. Whitehead, Chicago, 1898), pp. 55-56, 67-68, 120, 204-205.

[7]*Mondi, Celesti, Terrestri et Infernali* (Vinegia, 1562), pp. 12-13, 42-44.

[8]*Opera Omnia* (Lugduni, 1663), X, 12.

[9]*Deux Discours de la Nature du Monde, & ses parties* (Paris, 1578), pp. 69r, 88v-93r.

[10]*Idea Philosophiae Platonicae* (Marpurgi, 1612), pp. 198-200.

[11]*La Physique ou Science des Choses Naturelles* (Lyons, 1620), pp. 196-198.

[12]*Bref Discours de l'Excellence et dignité de l'homme* (Paris, 1560), p. 9.

[13]*The French Academy* (London, 1589), p. 19; "The Epistle to the Reader," *The Second Part of the French Academy* (London, 1594), sig. A7v-A8v.

[14]*Diateticon* (Lipsiae, 1607), p. 135.

[15]*Physica Harmonica* (Herbornae Nassoviorum, 1616), pp. 258-260-261, 265.

[16]*Newe Anatomie of Whole Man* (London, 1576), sig. 13v.

[17]*A Confutation of Atheism* (London, 1605), pp. 92-93.

[18]*Purchas his Pilgrim* (London, 1619), pp. 26, 29-30, 32-116.

[19]Pomponazzi makes an interesting nexus. "Quare Albertus in primo suo de animalibus ex sententia approbatorum phisionomorum et philosophorum dicit, quod homines in membris assimilantibus animalibus, gerunt naturam illius animalis: unde homo dictus est parvus mundus, quoniam tota natura tam superorum quam inferorum in natura umana est comprehensa." *De Naturalium Effectuum Causis sive de Incantationibus* (Basilea, 1556), p. 29.

[20]Greene, *Works* (Grosart, London, 1881-1883), III, 143; Harvey, *Works* (Grosart, London, 1884), II, 46; Nashe, *Works* (McKerrow, London, 1910), III, 13; Beaumont and Fletcher, *Works* (Waller, Cambridge, 1909), IV, 129; Dekker, *Works* (Grosart, London, 1884), I, 116, III, 348; Jonson, *Works* (Cunningham-Whalley, London, n.d.), I, 355, 441; II, 28-29; III, 96-97, 98; see also Webster, *Duchess of Malfi*, V, ii, 48-49 and Middleton, *A Fair Quarrel*, II, ii, 54.

[21]Material of this type may be found on almost every page of the *Opera Omnia* printed at Geneva in 1658; good examples will be found at the following references: I, 17, 20, 34, 99, 103, 191, 236, 598, 626, 631, 632; II, 101, 471, 517, 533, 664, 665; III, 63, 198.

[22]"De la causa, principio, et uno," *Le Opere Italiane* (de Lagarde, Gottinga, 1888), 1, 243-244.

[23]*Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes* (Cambridge, 1930), p. 50.

[24]Gascoigne, *The Glasse of Government* (Cunliffe, Cambridge, 1910), pp. 221, 234; Harvey, *op. cit.*, II, 9 ; I, 46, 48; Nashe, *op. cit.*, III, 186; Greene, *Plays and Poems* (Collins, Oxford, 1905), II, 133; *Works* (Grosart, London, 1881-1883), II, 98, 254; VI, 235; Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, First part, II, vii, 18-119; Lyly, *Works* (Bond, London, 1902), III, 55-56, 244; Dekker, *op. cit.*, II, 70, 224-225, 227; III, 346; *I Honest Whore*, I, i, I, iii; Chapman, *Works* (London, 1873), I, 182-183; II, 29-30, 307, 314; Heywood, *Works* (London, 1874), III, 163, 233, 362; V, 166, 170; Ford, *Works* (Gifford- Dyce, London, 1869), I, 57, 99; II, 75; III, 151, 156, 164-165, 166, 169.

[25]*Works* (Ellis-Spedding, London, 1889), I, 587; II, 641. For Bruno *vide supra.*

[26]See also: *Rich. II*, III, ii, 152-154; *A.Y.L.I.*, III, ii, 135-137.

[27]Further references pertinent to this paragraph are: *Henry V*, III, vii, 20-24; *W. T.*, V, i, 93-94; *L. L. L.*, IV, iii, 69; *M. of V.*, V, i, 60-65; *Temp.*, *I*, ii, 273-274; *Lear*, I, i, 111-112; *M. for M.*, 111, i, 7-11; *A. W.*, II, iii, 24-25.

[28]See also: *T. A.*, III, i, 221, 231; *K. J.*, V, ii, 40-53; *Rich. II*, III, iv, 161-163; *Rich. III* II, ii, 687; *R. and J.*, III, v, 127-128; *M. of V.*, I, i, 22-24; *M. A.*, I, i, 251-252; *Temp.* II, i, 141-142; Luc. 115-116, 586.

EDITORIAL NOTE

By S. A. T.

THE MYSTERY OF THE SHAKSPERE MANUSCRIPTS*

To most people it is a matter of great astonishment when they are told that the only existing specimens of Shakspere's handwriting are seven signatures and the words "By me" which precede the signature on the third page of the poet's last will and testament. No one seems to question the genuineness of the words "By me," probably because it is generally known that in Shakspere's day it was customary for a signator to write these words before his name. These seven signatures occur on the following documents: a mortgage and a deed relating to property which Shakspere and his theatrical associates bought in 1613 (March 10 and 11) in the city of London; one on each page of Shakspere's three-paged will (March 25, 1616) and, third, one which was discovered by the American Professor Chas. Wm. Wallace on a deposition (in the Bellott-Mountjoy lawsuit) made by the poet on May 11, 1612. In addition to these signatures, all on legal documents (and therefore of unquestioned validity), there is one, the finest of them all, on the flyleaf of a copy of John Florio's English translation of Montaigne's essays, published in 1603. This precious book, the only book known to have survived from Shakspere's library, is the property of the British Museum. There are besides more than a hundred books in the world, scattered in various countries, most of them in the United States, which contain forged signatures and annotations purporting to be in Shakspere's autograph.

The seven genuine Shakspere signatures are written in the Gothic script which was in general use in Shakspere's day for ordinary social, commercial, and literary purposes. Persons unacquainted with this script think that the signatures are badly written, that they were written by a person who either did not know how to write or was suffering from some disease, such as writer's cramp, epilepsy, chronic alcoholism, or shaking palsy. To one who knows the script, however, the writing is apparently the work of a skillful penman. How unlike the Gothic script of Shakspere's day is from our modern Roman hand may be judged from the fact that some years ago an enthusiastic Baconian misread the words "By me" in Shakspere's will as "25th March." And yet this individual had the effrontery to write a pamphlet to prove that Shakspere could not write and therefore could not have been the author of the plays and poems which go under his name. It may be added here that the "anti-Stratfordians" almost invariably distort and falsify "facsimiles" of Shakspere's autographs.

The absence of a manuscript in Shakspere's hand is always the occasion for astonishment in circles unacquainted with history. In truth, there is not the slightest mystery about the disappearance of Shakspere's manuscripts. It must be remembered that not a single play written for the public theatre by Ben Jonson has come down in his own handwriting. Beaumont and Fletcher wrote many more plays than Shakspere did but not a single one of their manuscripts is extant. Of Francis Beaumont we have not even a single signature, nor of Robert Greene (one of the most prolific and versatile of Shakspere's con-

**A lecture broadcast by Station WNYC from the New York World's Fair on August 2, 1939.*

temporaries), nor of Christopher Marlowe. And we might ask where is the manuscript of Spenser's *Faerie Queene,* of Philip Sidney's *Arcadia,* of Bacon's *Essays,* of Walter Raleigh's *History of the World,* etc.?

The explanation for the disappearance of Shakspere's manuscripts is undoubtedly to be found in the following facts. First, the manuscripts of the plays were the property of the theatre, not of the poet, and were probably used as prompt-copies. Frequent handling of these documents in the theatre would have wrought such damage in them that they would ultimately have been thrown away—after transcripts of them had been made.

Second, in 1613 the Globe Theatre, of which Shakspere was part owner and in which his manuscripts were unquestionably housed, was burned to the ground during a performance of one of his own plays. In that fire many of his manuscripts must have been destroyed.

Third, in Shakspere's day the manuscripts of a playwright, especially an actor playwright, were held in such low esteem that no one would have thought of preserving them.

Fourth, after a manuscript had been printed, it was not considered of any importance to preserve it, assuming even that the manuscript was not then too filthy and ragged to be preserved.

Fifth, in 1598 the town of Stratford was visited by two great conflagrations which destroyed many buildings. In these fires much of Shakspere's correspondence must have been lost. In this connection must also be mentioned the fire which destroyed Ben Jonson's private library. In that fire some of Shakspere's manuscripts and other papers (letters) were probably destroyed. While speaking of fires, we must not omit to mention the great fire in London in 1666 which destroyed a very large part of the city; in this fire many Elizabethan relics, including Shakspere's books and papers, were probably lost.

Sixth, an important factor in the loss and destruction of Shakspere books and manuscripts was the Puritanism of the poet's daughter and son-in-law, Susannah and Dr. John Hall, the inheritors of Shakspere's home.

Seventh, a factor in the loss of Shakspere relics which must not be overlooked is the razing (1759) of New Place, Shakspere's home in Stratford, by the Reverend Francis Gastrell, who resented the visits to the place by curiosity seekers and Shakspere worshippers.

COMMUNICATION

SHAKSPERE IN JAPAN

In these dark days of international estrangement it should be timely to record an instance of the fact that Shaksperian study may still be a living bond between us and our fellows across the seven seas.

Professor Hyder E. Rollins, in his new Variorum edition of Shakspere's *Poems* (1938, p. 470, n. 4), quotes from the *Wilson Bulletin* of December, 1928, concerning Yuzo Tsubouchi's "'complete translation of the works of . . . Shakespeare into the Japanese language,'" but adds that he did "not know whether or not the poems are included" in this edition. In reviewing this volume elsewhere,* I have noted that the Japanese translation does include *Venus and Adonis, Lucrece,* and the *Sonnets,* but not the other poems ascribed to Shakspere. This information, together with certain additional notes concerning the work of the Japanese translator, was kindly furnished by Mr. Tatsuro Hijikata, Professor of English in the Daigo Koto Gakko, Kumamoto, Japan, and transmitted to me by his colleague—my friend—Professor James Baird. These gentlemen, feeling "that there is too little relation between scholarship in America and England and that in Japan" offer to send further information if desired. Meanwhile I think that their supplementary notes on the Japanese translator will interest American Shakperians, since most of us know little or nothing about his work.

I quote from a letter by Messrs. Hijikata and Baird, dated January 28, 1939.

"The *Poems* have also been studied and interpreted by various Japanese students. But the only important addition to Tsubouchi's work is the commentary on *Venus and Adonis,* The *Rape of Lucrece,* and the *Sonnets* by Yoshisaburo Okakura (Kenkyusha English Classics, Tokyo), designed to supplement the notes of the translator.

Shoyo (Yuzo) Tsubouchi's task is hailed by every literary authority in Japan. His . . . reading [of] original texts is sound; and his Japanese is of very good style.

His method of approach is to appreciate Shakespeare from a purely dramatic or theatrical point of view. In this respect he is quite removed from [the] philosophical-idealistic criticism of Bradley or Dowden. He has the histrionic or realistic attitude of the playwright. Tsubouchi is a good dramatist in *Kabuki;*** he wrote some pseudo-classical dramas such as *Kiribitoha* or a rather modern version of *En-no-Gyoja.* Many of his works are often staged. He first translated *Julius Caesar* in 1884, and since then he has been translating the works of Shakespeare. What attracted him most in Shakespeare is the resemblance of Shakespeare's dramaturgy to certain aspects of *Kabuki*: hence his wonderful translation that far surpasses the usual tedious translations of English drama by our academic scholars. But this *Kabuki* atmosphere, though it often produces fascinating results, as often fails—and prevents us from grasping the true Shakespeare.

Tsubouchi, moreover, is poor in . . . lyric genius; thus his translations of Shakespeare's *Poems* is unsatisfactory. Unfortunately he was too old when he did the work to sympathize with the youthful spirit of the poems which he undertook to translate. His *Venus and Adonis, Lucrece,* and *Sonnets* are very archaic in style, and fall far short of his great achievement in *Hamlet, Lear,* and *Othello.* His *Midsummer Night's Dream* is positively inferior. However, he is the only man who has accomplished this most difficult task in Japan, and he is worth praising almost without qualification."

ALWIN THALER.

University of Tennessee.

J. E. G. P., July 1939.

**Farcical Japanese folk comedy of the late sixteenth-century and after.